

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

OCTOBER 16, 1937

WHO'S WHO

GEORGE HENRY PAYNE has been a member of the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, since 1934. During these years he has "been waging a lonely but necessary fight" to establish the principles that he enunciates in his article. Mr. Payne brings to his present position a power of thought and idealism and experience that has grown through sixty active years. A lawyer far back at the turn of the century, he was successively a publisher and editor, a musical and dramatic critic on the *New York Telegram*, a political commentator on the *New York Post*, a lecturer on history and the development of American journalism, an author of a wide variety of books, and was engaged in major political activities. He is not a Catholic, but his views on radio programs, we believe, perfectly express the Catholic viewpoint. . . . LAURENCE KENT PATTERSON is Professor of History at Woodstock College, Md., and former lecturer on old and contemporary history at Fordham University and the Catholic University of America. He is a prodigious gatherer of facts on governmental and political matters, and a keen analyst of personalities and tendencies, both in the United States and abroad. . . . JOSEPH P. MERRICK mailed his article from Sulaikh, Baghdad, Iraq. He teaches mathematics to young Baghdadians and is director of the meteorological station of Baghdad College.

NEXT WEEK: two startling articles on Spain by two distinguished non-Catholics: Gault Macgowan on conditions in Red Spain, and John Eoghan Kelly on recruiting in the United States for Red Spain.

THIS WEEK

COMMENT	26
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Radio Programs Throttle the Spiritual George Henry Payne	28
France Falters in Social Upheaval Laurence K. Patterson	30
A Justice Explains What Cannot Be Explained Paul L. Blakely	32
If the United States Becomes a Dictatorship John A. Toomey	33
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF John LaFarge	35
EDITORIALS	36
A Dead Amendment . . . The Official View . . . The American View . . . As War Clouds Gather . . . Labor and the N.L.R.B. . . . Blue Eagles . . . In His Image.	
CHRONICLE	39
CORRESPONDENCE	41
LITERATURE AND ARTS	
Red Retreat: A Spiritual Reflection Joseph P. Merrick	43
Ernest Hello	David Gordon 44
BOOKS	REVIEWED BY 45
Karl Marx: Man and Fighter	
Karl Marx: The Story of His Life.. John LaFarge	
Napoleon, The Portrait of a King.... R. Corrigan	
Forty Years of American Life.... Arthur Gleason	
THEATRE	Elizabeth Jordan 47
FILMS	Thomas J. Fitzmorris 48
EVENTS	The Parader 48

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,
JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE.

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., October 16, 1937, Vol. LVIII, No. 2, Whole No. 1462. Telephone BARclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Europe, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

MANY questions arise, demanding answers, from the publication of the *Open Letter in reply to Spanish Hierarchy's Recent Views of War*, signed by 150 Protestant ministers, clergymen and laymen. The most insistent, the most fundamental question is this: Do these 150 signatories represent American Protestantism, and are they the spokesmen for Protestant sentiment on this question, or any question? Does their Open Letter express the normal Protestant view on the Spanish Catholic Church and the American Catholic Church? If these 150 are the spokesmen of American Protestantism, then there will be, and must be, inevitably, a recurrence of the bigotry and intolerance toward Catholicism that has blemished the record of the United States for full and complete religious liberty in the past. If these 150 are not the spokesmen for American Protestants, if they express only the minority view of Left Wing Protestantism, then, in honor and justice the truly Christian Protestants of the United States must make their statement on the Joint Letter of the Spanish Bishops. Silence on the part of the responsible American Protestant leaders can be interpreted only as agreement.

To help the Christian Protestants of the United States in making their decision, I cite from the announcement made last month in London and just released here: "A committee comprised of members of British non-Catholic churches has been formed here 'in order to cooperate with the Roman Catholic Church with a view to presenting a United Christian Front against the Red menace to Christianity; to deal with certain fallacies which are diverting the natural sympathy of British people from the victims of the present anti-Christian campaign in Spain; and to give practical expression of sympathy with these victims.'"

"The members of the Committee are: The Bishop of Brechin, Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church; the Bishop of Glasgow; the Dean of Durham; Dr. J. E. Rattenbury, prominent Wesleyan minister and author of theological texts; Canon N. P. Williams, Professor of Divinity at Oxford; Rev. H. B. Workman, Secretary of the Education Committee of the Methodist Church; Sir Henry Lunn, vice-president of the Liberal Council, the League of Nations Union and the Anglo-Hellenic League; Canon Douglas, Southwark Cathedral; the Earle of Dalhousie; Lord Ruthven; Lord Phillimore; Sir Donald Cameron of Lochiel; Sir Archibald Hurd; J. B. Atkins of the Spectator and Guardian; Dr. Hall, O.B.E., Missionary Secretary of the Church of Scotland; Dr. Benjamin Gregory, editor of the Methodist Times; Canon Mozley, St. Paul's Cathedral; Mr. Angus Watson, ex-chairman of the Congregational Union; Athelstan Riley, Seigneur de la Trinite, Jersey.'"

An initial circular has been issued by this Com-

mittee, wherein it is written: "The statement that Protestant churches have been suppressed in that territory (Nationalist) is false. General Franco affirmed in a broadcast speech on 19th February 1937 that he stands for freedom of conscience and religious toleration. He himself clearly stated to Sir Walter Maxwell Scott early in this year that under his rule Protestants should be assured complete freedom to practise their religion."

In a statement just published by Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, the Foreign Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches affirms: "The numerically negligible Protestants of Spain are in acute distress, not so much as minorities, but because they have the bad luck to be Spaniards."

There is absolutely no persecution of Protestants or Jews in the Nationalist territory held by General Franco; there is no interference in their observance of their religion, and no discrimination against them because of their religious professions. But in the territory of Loyalist Spain, not only have the Catholic ministers of religion been executed in thousands, forced into hiding, hunted down or out of the country, not only have Catholic edifices been destroyed, not only have all Catholic religious ceremonies been banned, but Protestant and Jewish religious bodies have also suffered considerably, and will suffer more if Communism, professedly anti-God, and Anarchism, essentially atheistic, conquer Spain.

The Open Letter signed by the 150 Protestant clergymen and laymen is a challenge, not to Catholicism, but to Protestant Christianity.

The above is the text of a letter sent to the New York Times by the Editor.

— — —

JUDGING from the inferences, expressed and implied, in the Open Letter published in the *New York Times* to which some 150 Protestant clergymen affixed their signatures, it is safe to affirm that the majority never even read the recent pastoral letter of the Spanish hierarchy. If they had, they would have seen the reasonableness and logic of the position taken by the Spanish bishops. The pastoral letter was not an academic discussion nor the development of a thesis. It was an expression of fact that between Christianity and Communistic atheism there can be no compromise. And if the Protestant clergymen are to continue to occupy their pulpits, there can be no alternative in this country either. All legal means had been tried in Spain and found fruitless. Against the proposed atheistic revolution that was to have been launched in July, the counter Nationalist revolt arose. When the impious clause in the Constitution of 1931 expelled certain religious orders, the bishops objected, but for the sake

of peace submitted. When the private schools owned and controlled by religious were closed and the property iniquitously confiscated by the State, again for the sake of peace they submitted. But when in 1936 the Red horde that controlled the Government began destroying churches and chapels, and barbarously murdering priests, religious and laymen to the hundreds of thousands without trial for purely political and religious motives, the Spanish nation arose with the cry: "Long live Spain! Long live Christ the King!" No, it was not an academic question; it was a practical one. The issue was Spain or Russian Communism. Against that alternative practically there can be but one choice.

- - -

RINGING words of praise echoed from the press all over the country for President Roosevelt's admirable address in Chicago on October 5. It was a straightforward presentation of the principles of international morality and justice. It was a stinging rebuke to the nations who act, if they do not openly assert, that treaties are "merely scraps of paper." "There must be a return," in his emphatic manner he asserted, "to the belief in the pledged word, in the value of a signed treaty. There must be recognition of the fact that national morality is as vital as private morality." To a man the country stands behind the President that every lawful means must be employed to keep the nation from beligerent international entanglements. Participation, nevertheless, with other nations in sanctions and like measures presents serious hazards which only the utmost caution and wariness can avoid. It is true that modern inventions have almost eliminated time and space, and that consequently the country is more closely linked with the rest of the world. Still the people of the United States positively are opposed to foreign imbrolios. The President's words reflect well the sentiment of the people.

- - -

FLATTERING publicity was given by the press to the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the National Council of Catholic Women and to the resolutions which the 500 delegates passed during their four days at Washington. The newspaper accounts were no dull summaries, but colorful and lively stories that featured the healthy uproars created by some of the more controversial issues. The press, remembering a recent gathering of medical men in Atlantic City, gave plenty of space to the Catholic women's rousing curse on birth control, and it found their interest in world peace and their sympathy for the German refugees particularly impressive. It failed, however, to see the importance of the Tuesday morning session in which the Council agreed to continue its plan of holding an industrial institute. Here is a project boldly aiming at training young women to become Catholic leaders in the field of industrial relations, and AMERICA can find only the highest words of praise for it. But we cannot say as much for the convention's resolutions on the motion pictures. The ladies aimed a

haymaker at lurid and salacious advertising of the films. But we feel bound to say that, although we follow film advertising pretty carefully, we have not noticed anything lurid or salacious in the ads of the major companies for more than two years, and we still hold that the special bureau in the Hays office, created to suppress just that sort of thing, has been doing a first-rate job—which, it seems to us, the women ought to appreciate. Moreover, although Bishop Noll complained bitterly about the embarrassment of permitting Catholic organizations to act discordantly, to bump heads and contradict each other, we note that the Catholic women condemned block booking and blind buying of motion pictures. Have the ladies of the NCCW forgotten that another Catholic organization, the Legion of Decency, established an official policy and position on this question which is exactly contrary to their resolution?

- - -

HOW many sermons are there in a course of sermons? Are three enough to comprise a course? Our question is inspired by the fact that there are three more Sundays in October. And so even the most harried of pastors still has time to prepare a series of instructions preparatory to the Feast of Christ the King. The Encyclical *Quas Primas* was published nearly twelve years ago. In that document not only did the Pope direct a re-consecration of the human race to the Sacred Heart, but he also ordered that "before this annual celebration sermons be preached to the people in every parish, informing and instructing them accurately on the nature, manner, and importance of the subject." We point out this injunction without comment on how well it has been observed. But even without the Holy Father's command, no better or more timely subject could be chosen for the parish Sunday sermons in these days of totalitarian states, Godless education, mounting divorce, internal and international strife. Legislators, councils and dictators are still playing their old game, but there is special need today for Catholics to meditate upon the rights and authority of Christ the King, and to pray for freedom and immunity from harm for the Church as well as for peace and order among the nations. Last Sunday afternoon on the radio Father Wilfrid Parsons, former editor of AMERICA, gave the second of a series of talks upon the doctrine. Pastors will do well to remind their people of the radio series.

- - -

THE Pro Parvulis Book Club, a very active organization located in the Empire State Building, New York, is to be congratulated on its ensemble of active editors and collaborators. Mr. Alan Drady, of San Francisco, has joined the staff of the New York office. Mr. Emmet Lavery is Editor of the "Little Theatre for Little People" Department of the *Herald*. This, the Club's publication, has appeared in an elaborate and artistic format, and is the long felt *desideratum* of public librarians and school counselors.

RADIO PROGRAMS THROTTLE THE SPIRITUAL

Materialists and sophisticates control the air

GEORGE HENRY PAYNE

NO PERSON informed on radio will deny that there has been little, if any, consideration given to the spiritual aspects of this extraordinary invention and development.

In fact, when more than a year ago I ventured to suggest that there was such an aspect, one of the most respected experts in my Commission looked at me in a slightly dazed fashion and politely asked me in what way I found that there was any difference between the invention and discovery of radio and other inventions and discoveries.

Coming from a man for whom I had respect, this viewpoint was something of a shock because it showed how completely intelligent persons were ignoring the fact that this development penetrated the spiritual and cultural side of the home as no other invention of man has ever done. This view ignored the fact that millions of persons, unwarned and unguarded, might be affected both in their material and spiritual views of life, without the protection of hearing the warning views of those who know the danger of insidious propaganda.

The danger of radio politically was early understood by Congress and lawmakers generally. In the Communications Act of 1934, it was decreed that when political views of members of one party are sent over the air, it is incumbent on the owners of the radio station to permit the political views of those of opposing parties to have time to express their views. Very fine, politically! But how about the more important questions of moral views?

Several religious bodies have campaigned for such an equality of right but the experience of the Paulist Fathers would indicate that there is little understanding of the fact that moral rights are superior to political rights and, more profoundly, political rights are dependent on the upholding of moral principles.

Back of the failure to develop or even show cognizance of the spiritual aspect of what goes over the radio is not only indifference to the spiritual aspect of our life and culture, but an antipathy to it, unconscious, I believe, in most instances but conscious in enough instances to be important.

Case 1. Not long ago an official of a broadcasting company, a Mr. A., came to my office to discuss, as

I thought, the possibility of improving the radio programs. The discussion began and ended, as far as he was concerned, with the idea that radio programs *in toto* were absolutely pure and perfect. Hopelessly, but with the desire to make one final effort, I drew out of my desk letters and expressions from many college presidents throughout the country and showed him that they were far from satisfied with the present setup. His answer, I think, is historic. He looked at the letters contemptuously and remarked: "What do them college presidents know about radio?"

Case 2. Some months later, Mr. B., interested and influential in broadcasting—a man of culture as well as means—in a discussion of what he called my endeavor "to reform radio," frankly declared that for the large cities he thought that the programs were not "sophisticated" enough. He went on to explain to his slightly astonished listener that from his point of view there was too much "fireside stuff." If this view had come from an individual who was simply a listener it would not have been so astonishing as representative of the thoughtless way in which many American business men look at the serious problems of life. Coming from a man financially interested and influential, it was a bit disheartening. The contemptuous attitude toward the "sticks," as they designate the homes of people who live on farms, from a man who could influence the character of programs that went into thousands of American homes, it seems a dangerous doctrine. Mr. B. was not apologetic in his attitude of mind. Moreover, he was aggressive in his belief in "sophisticated" programs.

Case 3. Not many weeks ago, on a Sunday evening, I turned to a certain frequency to listen to some music. I left the room when the part of the program that I wanted to hear ended, and when I came back my attention was abruptly called to the fact that a man was giving a talk in which there was a frank discussion on prostitution. I listened to it with amazement. It was not offensively told and a great deal of it was possibly important for adult minds. But that this talk should be sent into thousands of homes which did not want such a discussion before members of their family and their children was a shocking revelation that this idea of

"sophisticated" broadcasts was ready to go to extremes.

Case 4. Mr. C., a man influential and prominent in broadcasting management, with a great deal more idealism than most of the commercial broadcasters, in explaining to me his problems and his desire to do the right thing, laid down as fundamental the theorem: "The business of broadcasting is the business of showmanship." He went on to say that he was proud of the fact that he was a "showman." I do not think that this particular individual would have countenanced or permitted the incident that I have referred to in *Case 3*. While he might not have a definite conception in his mind, I think his leaning would be away from the "sophistication" of the witness in *Case 2*. But weighed down by the commercial aspects of broadcasting, he has arrived at the point where he can only see it as a business, with the ideas and patois of the movies, against which the Legion of Decency made its fight.

We have here a philosophy, not enunciated with any particular clarity, but definitely tending toward the development of a philosophy distinctly materialistic or, as Mr. B. said, openly "sophisticated." I have never heard this much-used word so openly used with a meaning dangerous not only to spiritual truth and culture, but antagonistic to all Christian philosophy and to the teachings of the spiritual leaders of all religions.

It is quite possible that those who have advocated the "sophisticated" philosophy are acquainted with the origin of the philosophy and the word as it appeared in Greece, but there is little evidence of this. It would probably be surprising to some of them to learn that the sophists of Greece were charged by Plato with being teachers of immorality and openly admitting that the philosophy was immoral. Even those who defended the sophists as having been caricatured by Plato, both in the *Protagoras* and in the *Gorgias*, admit that the sophists believed that there was no such thing as right and wrong by nature, but only by convention. For men there was no eternal right because there was no eternal truth. Protagoras himself said: "That which appears just and honorable to each city, is so for that city, as long as the opinion is entertained."

In other words, the only law that the sophists admitted was police law. This denial of abstract truth and abstract justice, which dominates the sophists' philosophy, would become the doctrine of those who today declare themselves in favor of what they call "sophisticated" programs over the air, in place of programs that would teach truth and inculcate justice and a respect for the spiritual aspects of life and culture.

The retort, of course, will be made by those dedicated to "sophisticated" programs that there have been instances where religious programs have failed to interest the public or where there has been misrepresentation. It will be charged, also, that those who would broaden the spiritual and cultural output of broadcasting have shown themselves incapable of developing the proper "technique."

Such sophistry will not blind anyone to the fact that from the very beginning, when radio was in the hands of manufacturers, up to the present time, the tendency has been to popularize material that appealed to those with an appetite for sensationalism or give those, jaded with the labors of the day, something "restful," unstimulating to thought.

A battle made by the late Congressman Connery for investigation of the industry was originated in his desire to purge the programs and in that process discover means of popularizing a higher appeal. The abuse heaped upon this noble man by those who asseverated that the public was getting what it wanted, was an indication of how bitterly, how unscrupulously, at times, they fought reform.

President Sproul of California, speaking of the defense made by the radio industry that they "were giving the public what it wanted," said: "It may be true, as the broadcasters assert, that people are satisfied with what they are getting, but that does not prove that they would not like something better. The public has been taught to want what it is getting. It has received twelve years of concentrated instruction from an expert corps of teachers."

Some months ago I was in a hospital. One morning, as the attending surgeon was performing his matutinal observations, the nurse came in to announce that Dr. Alexis Carrel and Dr. C. Ward Crampton would pay a social visit that afternoon.

"You know the great Carrel!" exclaimed Dr. Blank, whose admiration and respect up to this point had been confined entirely to his own work, with the impersonal quality of the genial surgeon.

I admitted the soft impeachment and for the first time in several weeks of domination and ether I saw that I had become a human being.

Dr. Carrel came, punctually, and the hour that he stayed was one of the most interesting of my long experience. Gentle, charming, with beautiful diction, he talked of many things—always with his fine spiritualistic touch. This statement I shall always remember: "It is apparent that in the impending war in Europe, neither group may be strong enough to defeat the other group, with the result that civilization may be driven back to this continent for its survival and continuance. What are we doing to develop spiritually our people for this great responsibility?"

One hot summer day in Washington, during the *brouhaha* of adjournment of Congress, a young newspaper man rushed into the office and pleaded:

"Do you know any news? Give me a news story!"

I thought for a moment and then reached over and picked up the volume of Thomas à Kempis.

"I will give you a story eternally new and eternally old,"—and I read this passage:

"In all things look to the end, and how thou shalt be able to stand before a strict judge, to whom nothing is hidden; who taketh no bribes, nor receiveth excuses, but will judge that which is just.

"O most wretched and foolish sinner, what answer wilt thou make to God, who knoweth all thy sins; thou who sometimes fearest the looks of an angry man?"

FRANCE FALTERS IN SOCIAL UPHEAVAL

Political forces line up in a critical conflict

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON, S.J.

SEVEN political families, according to Albert Thibaudet, are to be found in France. The "Traditionalists" comprise Royalists and Bonapartists, as well as Conservatives, who accept the Republic for the sake of peace and stability. This group is not Fascist, though certain elements in it would welcome a "man on horseback" as the solution of the present crisis.

The "Christian Socialists" are loyal to the Republic though opposed to the anti-clerical lay laws. Their social program is advanced. *La jeune République* is typical of this group.

The "Liberals" form a third political family. Loyal to the principles of '89, this element is conservative in its social outlook. French Liberals today are not, as a class, hostile to the Church. Many, however, oppose any modification of the lay laws, to whose rigid enforcement, especially in regard to religious congregations, they are also averse.

A fourth political family, whatever labels it may assume, represents in reality Industrialism and Big Business.

These four groups form the Right and Center in French politics, extending from the fanatics of *L'Action Française* and the followers of de la Rocque to "Republicans of the Left" and "Independent Radicals." It is strange to find Republicans of the Left and even Independent Radicals classed with the Right and Centre. But the group system in France is a real mystic maze. "With what party are you affiliated?", the late Sir Austen Chamberlain inquired of a French deputy. "I am a Republican of the Left," came the answer. "I sit with the Centre, and usually vote with the Right!" Yet our own Democratic party still embraces President Roosevelt and Carter Glass!

The French "Left," which triumphed in 1936 as a Popular Front, comprises the Radical-Socialists, the Socialists proper and the Communists.

The Radical-Socialists are the lineal descendants of the Jacobins. Since 1877 this party and its allies have generally dominated the Third Republic. The lay laws are its work, and it remains fanatically devoted to the lay Republic. "Equality, *laïcité*, reason" are its watchwords. Radical-Socialists are anti-clerical and equalitarian in their outlook. Yet they are patriots and attached to the

system of private property, though distrustful of high finance and big business. The party is also Mason-ridden. All of its leaders are either affiliated to the sect or work in close collaboration with *la Veuve*. Radical-Socialism is especially strong among the *petite bourgeoisie* and it also finds many adherents among the peasantry, especially in de-Christianized rural areas. Government functionaries abound in its ranks.

Radical-Socialists, as a group, cherish no really revolutionary ideas in the social sphere. They desire to curb big business and the oligarchy of finance, yet are firm believers in private property. Nevertheless, hostility to clericalism, dread of the Fascist menace and distrust of big business caused the leaders of this party to form the Popular Front in 1936.

French Socialists comprise the right wing of Marxism. 1936 was a year of victory, no less than 148 Socialists being returned to the Chamber of Deputies, almost one-quarter of the total. Socialism, largely dominates the U. G. T. (*Union Générale de Travail*), the French A. F. of L. The backbone of the party is recruited from the urban laborers, yet it also has adherents among the intellectuals, the professional classes, the lower bourgeoisie, and even the peasants. Of late, French Socialism has tended to accept "the inevitability of gradualness." It is committed to the abolition of Capitalism and the building of a Socialist Commonwealth. Yet it employs parliamentary tactics and its leaders deplore violent revolutionary action as unwise. French Socialists now cooperate with bourgeois allies. The Blum and Chautemps Ministries were and are equally divided between Marxist and bourgeois elements.

The Blum regime legalized collective bargaining, passed a forty-hour law, nationalized the armaments industry, granted vacations with pay to the workers and radically reformed the government of the Bank of France. Blum dissolved the *Croix de Feu* and other alleged Fascist leagues. The Socialists have supported Chautemps in nationalizing the railways. Much of this legislation seems sound, and quite in accordance with Catholic principles. But some observers think that Blum attempted too sweeping reforms in a hurried manner. It is only

fair to admit that Blum, though a Marxian and a Mason, did not attempt to persecute the Church during his term of office. An effort to introduce the opening wedge of the lay laws into Alsace produced vehement protests and was soon withdrawn. Yet French Socialism remains anti-clerical. Many of its leaders are Masons; and *Le Populaire*, its official organ, of which Blum was formerly Director, assails the Papacy and the Church with vehemence. French "Communists" formed the "Popular Front" with Socialist and Radical-Socialists in 1935. The leader of Communism in France is Comrade Thorez, who is a member of the Komintern. The party organ, *L'Humanité*, has an enormous circulation in Paris and the provinces. In May, 1936, seventy-two Communists were returned to the Chamber of Deputies, out of a total of 618. The popular vote of the party rose from 800,000 in 1932 to 1,450,000 in 1936, approximately fifteen per cent of the total vote of 9,840,000. In Paris and its suburbs the Communist vote was 316,000. There are 303,000 party members in France, and over 4,100 cells are active in factories, schools, etc.

Communism in France is strongest among the workers in great industrial centers. But its leaders strive to penetrate the *petite bourgeoisie* and the peasantry. "Common Front" propaganda depicts Communism as a "patriotic movement," and the logical sequence of the French Revolution. Since the Franco-Soviet alliance, anti-militarism has been muffled. The French army is lauded as a bulwark against Fascism and a worthy ally of the Red army of Russia. Stalin sees in French Communism a strong support for the Russo-French Pact. French Communists assure the peasantry that they are friends of the small owner. Irreligious and blasphemous propaganda has been abated. *L'Humanité* appeals to Catholic toilers as friends: "We stretch out our hand to you, Catholic workers"; "France, free, strong, and happy"; "True popular democracy"; "Soviets everywhere" are watchwords of French Communism which regards itself as the "dauphin of Socialism" and awaits the hour to strike. The Common Front involves a change in tactics but the fundamental principles and objectives of Communism remain unchanged.

Will Blum or Chautemps prove the French Kerensky? Is there real danger of social upheaval and civil war in France?

No one can deny the reality of the Communist menace in France. But the difficulties in the way of Bolshevizing the nation are immense. A final victory for Franco in Spain will abate the menace. Again, the Right and Center are ready to fight to the last ditch against any attempted Communistic *coup d'état*. Radical-Socialists, if a violent crisis arose, would as a class resist Communism. Chautemps himself has denounced Communism because "it produces panic and social hatred." In October, 1936, the annual Congress of the party reiterated its loyalty to the Declaration of the Rights of Man as the charter of democracy. "The Declaration consecrates the sanctity of property." The Congress also denounced the seizure of factories as an attack on liberty.

France faces a real crisis. Peasant unrest is deep and widespread, yet the wide distribution of ownership in land constitutes a bulwark against social revolution. In 1931 out of 2,413,000 farms in France, 1,340,000 were one-man properties. In addition there were 1,042,000 farms with from one to five helpers.

Even in industry 1,168,000 French artisans work on their own. Out of 761,000 manufacturing plants in France, 560,000 employ less than ten workers. This wide distribution of landed property and the great spread of small scale industry are hardly conducive to the advent of Communism.

Yet France stands in need of radical social and political reforms. The parliamentary system is often inept, at times tainted by corruption. The control of credit is monopolized by a small group. Big business is often selfish and short-sighted, and the peasants have legitimate grievances. M. Bardoux declares that France needs a regime "which will respect liberty and true equality. The middle class must be freed from certain abuses in Capitalism which tend to drive them towards Communism. Small business should be fostered."

For more than fifty years French public education has been "lay," that is, godless. The urban masses are largely de-Christianized. Many peasant areas have been paganized through the lay school and the anti-Catholic press. French Catholics have done splendid work in proclaiming the Social Gospel of Christ. But among the paganized masses the propaganda of the Common Front, true to its watchword, "capitalize every grievance," still spreads.

It is not probable that Thorez and his colleagues expect an immediate social upheaval in France. They seek for the present to indoctrinate an increasing number of toilers and peasants with the teachings and promises of Communism. They strive to maintain and strengthen the alliance of France with their master, Stalin. They await the hour to strike, perhaps in the wake of another world war.

As with us, so in France, mere negation will never beat back the menace of the Common Front. French Catholics must show to the toiling masses that in the Church of their fathers they possess their most loyal protector and friend. Splendid Catholic social action is being done in France. It is the truest antidote to the poison of Communism and the menace of civil strife.

In October, 1936, the French Cardinals, in a joint pastoral, declared: "The choice of France is a question of life and death. France must be loyal to her Christian principles, her Latin culture and her traditions. Then she will enjoy wise and happy liberty." The soul of France is Catholic. Her history and traditions are rooted in the Faith. Through the teachings of the Faith France can correct the abuses of Capitalism, end the evil legacy of Liberalism and Radicalism, restore the vitality of her family and become the standard bearer of the Cross in our modern world. Belloc seems correct when he declares: "France is the battleground." On the issue of the conflict there waged may well hinge the future of Christian culture in Europe.

A JUSTICE EXPLAINS WHAT CANNOT BE EXPLAINED

"But yet the pity of it, Iago!"

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

WHEN Justice Black stepped before the microphone last month, he had much to explain. The spectacle was novel. For the first time in American history, we saw a Presidential appointee who felt obliged to defend in a public address his fitness to sit on the bench of the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, Justice Black explained nothing. Bad as was his former plight, it was made worse by his plea of confession and avoidance. Beginning with a profession of life-long devotion to religious and civic liberty, he ended by admitting that he had freely sought membership in an association formed to destroy religious and civic liberty. His admission was coupled with no expression of regret for what he had done, with no word of condemnation for the Klan.

A man sure of his innocence would have attacked the whole indictment boldly and directly. But there were four counts in the indictment which Justice Black utterly ignored.

1. Why did Mr. Black join the Klan in 1922? In answering this question, it is important to recall his claim that all his life he had defended civil and religious liberty. But when he joined the Klan, either he knew that this association had been formed to destroy religious and civil liberty, or he did not know. Assuming that he knew, it is impossible to see in him an apostle of liberty. If he did not know, his intelligence was considerably below the average in Alabama.

2. Why did he remain a member, on his own admission, for some four years? Attributing to him a very ordinary degree of intelligence, he knew what the Klan was doing in the years between 1922 and 1926. Its purposes could not possibly have been hidden from him. Either Mr. Black knew what the Klan was and in spite of his knowledge retained his membership, or he retained his membership ignorant of the unspeakably dishonorable course of the Klan. If the first, he was a bigot. If the second, his intelligence was hardly above that of a moron.

3. On resigning from the Klan, why did he accept a certificate of life-membership in the Klan? The evidence on this point has not been questioned by Justice Black, except to say that when he received it he did not know what it was. This answer may save him from the guilt of bigotry, but only

at the expense of his intelligence. Until the charge is refuted satisfactorily, the inference is inevitable that Mr. Black accepted this membership because, in spite of his devotion to religious and civil liberty, he did not dare, as Underwood dared, to defy and condemn the Klan.

4. Why did Senator Black permit the Senate to confirm him on the assumption, put forward during the Senate debates, that he had never been a member of the Klan?

Senator Borah's rejection of the charge that Senator Black had been a member of the Klan rested on a statement made by Mr. Black himself:

There has never been at any time one iota of evidence that Senator Black was a member of the Klan. . . . We know that Senator Black has said in private conversation, not since this matter came up but at other times, that he was not a member of the Klan, and there is no evidence to the effect that he is. (*Congressional Record*, August 17, 1937, p. 11651.)

In the course of the same debate, it was charged that Senator Black not only had been but still was a member of the Klan. One word from Senator Black would have cleared the atmosphere. It would also have prevented, in all probability, his confirmation by the Senate. But Senator Black, sitting in his office in the Senate building, did not speak that word. When the great crisis came, he was found lacking. He might have chosen candor, but he chose silence, and a place on the Supreme Court.

We entertain a certain sympathy for the man. "But yet the pity of it, Iago!" To every man there comes a time when he is tempted to sell his soul for advancement. There is a pathos in this tragedy, but we must not suffer our tears to blind us.

The lesson of this unhappy appointment goes far beyond the personal interests of Justice Black. As this Review contended when the appointment was announced, hereafter every appointment to a Federal bench must be scrutinized with unusual care. Hasty and ill-considered as was the selection of Senator Black, it seems to me that the chief burden of responsibility rests upon the Senate which refused to investigate Senator Black's Klan membership. If the constitutional independence of the Supreme Court and its integrity are to be saved, hereafter we can take nothing for granted.

IF THE UNITED STATES BECOMES A DICTATORSHIP

Will some correspondent write like this?

JOHN A. TOOMEY

(The recent wave of executions in the United States caused the Moscow Btvzwrp to instruct its Washington correspondent, Ivan Przwyzgbrkwz, to take his vacation in Canada and forward uncensored dispatches, revealing the actual situation in the United States. Mr. Przwyzgbrkwz, leaving his assistant, Gregor Cxgzxht, to conduct the Btvzwrp's Washington bureau, journeyed to Montreal, arriving just as the new year 1948 was being ushered in. He forwards the first uncensored dispatches to reach Europe since the mass executions started.

Montreal, January 3, 1948. (Uncensored).

I can easily conjecture the stunned amazement of Europeans when, through 1947, they heard the burst of gunfire all over the U. S. A., and read the unending stream of dispatches: "U. S. shoots eight in Arkansas. U. S. executes five in Wisconsin. U. S. shoots eight in Rhode Island." In Washington, where I had to submit all my articles to the Ministry of Propaganda, which, by the way, is now located in the Supreme Court building, I was unable to smuggle any important information through. Here in Montreal, I can speak out.

Why, I can almost hear my friends in Moscow asking, since the American people so heartily acquiesced in the Leader's grab for power, why this bath of blood? A few firing squads working on a few malcontents—that we could understand. Such a thing is necessary in any sharp shift from one ideology to another. But why the deluge of blood?

The answer is quite simple once a few factors not generally analyzed are understood. There are basic dissimilarities between Americans and Russians of our dear home-land. We, in our glorious country, have never had the misfortune to live under a horse-and-buggy form of government. (Editor's Note: horse-and-buggy government is one under which the Chief of State is harassed by Constitutional checks, slowed up by courts, etc.) Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and other such fooleries—we have never had personal contact with them. Every American, on the contrary, has had actual, personal experience of horse-and-buggy ideology. It was only in 1945 that the school textbooks, which taught reverence for horse-and-buggy forms, were altered, which means that every

American above the age of ten or eleven, was trained to respect such preposterous notions as, for example, that men simply because they are men have certain inalienable rights, that a Constitution set up by the people can be changed only by the people, that independent courts and parliaments are good things, and so on. If then, in our own dear Russia, which was never handicapped by all this nonsense, blood purges were found by experience to be an essential function of good government, how much more will this be true amid a population reared in the horse-and-buggy idiocy.

I hear my friends in Moscow and Ijdunigsvitch asking: if the American people cherish the archaic form of democracy why did they give it up so easily? The answer, though it may strike readers as incredible, is quite simple. The American people did not know they were giving up their antique democracy. They did not see the dictatorship coming. It was on their necks and in their hair before they knew what it was. They were told that the complex nature of modern life made it necessary for them to relinquish certain powers to the Leader, in order to aid the farmer and the workingman. They did not realize the extent of the powers they surrendered, nor that the powers travelled on a one-way street.

The transition from their antiquated democracy to the more progressive and liberal ideology was very gradual and almost invisible. The exterior forms of horse-and-buggy government were, and still are, maintained. Congress still meets. The Supreme Court still sits, though not in its original building. It now meets in the White House cellar next to the Executive coal bin. State lines were not officially wiped out. Each State still has a Governor who is now appointed by the Leader, and a Legislature also appointed by the Leader. It was as late as September, 1947, that the Stars and Stripes was put in the museums and the new flag proclaimed. Singing of the *Star Spangled Banner* was not proscribed until October, 1947. Not until April, 1947 did the Ministry of Propaganda assume full control of newspapers, radio and cinema.

Moreover, the new ideology is not called dictatorship. The Chief becomes furious when anyone refers to him as the Dictator. He is the People's Leader.

His government is a new and higher form of democracy. Under horse-and-buggy democracy, the people's will was ascertained by means of elections, which were often corrupt and always expensive. Under the new and higher form of democracy the People's Leader substitutes for the corrupt, expensive elections. One may ascertain what the people want now and also what they are going to want in the future, merely by interrogating the Leader, obviating the necessity of elections.

Reactionary circles deny that the Leader is as accurate as elections in this function. I have heard it whispered, for example, that many of the people, especially those executed, did not want this blood purge. In all fairness, I must put down evidence which, at first glance, would appear to substantiate this contention. A few months ago, I was dining in a New York restaurant when three agents of the W. P. A. (Editor's note: Formerly a relief group, now the secret police similar to our Cheka) dragged out five cooks to be shot. The cooks, I learned, had been sabotaging the soup creating a certain amount of discontent among the restaurant's clientele. The cooks quite frankly admitted they were opposed to the blood purge.

Against this apparent evidence, however, we have the Leader's definite statement: "The people want a blood purge." Who is in a better position to know what the people want, the people or the People's Leader? Very often, the people do not know what they want, whereas the Leader always knows, as any sceptic may learn from his speeches.

A new, progressive ideology is like a progressive, ultra-modern fashion. At one time Chinese women wore shoes which fit their feet. Then came a more modern vogue. The Chinese women had to wear shoes smaller than their feet. They had to change their feet to fit the shoes. The American people today are changing their feet to fit the new ideological shoes, and in a transition period of this sort there is certain to be some annoyance and discomfort. When in 1945 labor unions were abolished and workingmen forbidden to strike, dissatisfaction with the new form of democracy crept through labor ranks. When the Government commenced closing parochial schools in certain sections and placing restrictions on religious observances, discontent churned the religious group. As the Leader remarked at the time: "You can't please everybody." Dispossession of the farmers (Editor's note: kulaks) and the formation of collective farms occasioned fretting in the agricultural regions. Reforms essential to the newer democracy caused grumbling among professional men, non-professional men, white-collar workers, workers without collars and other groups.

Citizens were shot in batches of ten to fifteen. It was felt that shooting small batches, while it might take longer, would make a better impression abroad. On January 28, 1947, ten coal miners were executed in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. They were accused of spying for Bulgaria. The smoke from the Wilkes-Barre guns was the signal that set off a roar of firing heard in all parts of the land. The Government was inculcating the new democracy.

The vast number of farmers executed occasioned surprise. The Government's desire for crop reduction appears the logical explanation. The high proportion of executions among share-croppers caused wonder. It is likely that the Government sought to achieve a permanent solution of the knotty share-cropper problem while the purge was in process. Not all those arrested were shot. Some were only put in jail for twenty or thirty years. One incident I myself experienced illustrates the difficulties the Leader has to face. While visiting a prison in Pittsburgh, I saw a priest in a cell.

"Why don't you give up this foolishness?" I asked him. "If you renounce your religion, the Government will release you."

He replied: "I thank God He has given me the glory of suffering for His Name."

The blood bath has already produced a number of beneficial results. The Leader's power is more solidly established than ever. The unemployment problem has been solved. The task of the next census has been made appreciably lighter.

The Government is functioning smoothly under the new, more modern democracy. Congress works like a well-oiled machine. There is but one chamber, the Senate having been abolished. The long, dreary debates which blocked much legislation are a thing of the past. The Speaker says: "The Leader wants this bill approved. Stand up." The Congress then stands up. The Speaker declares: "The bill is approved. Sit down." The Congress then sits down. The session of Congress lasts two days, and is held once a year. In the interim, however, the Leader's secretaries, deputized as Congressmen, pass whatever legislation may be necessary. The judiciary has been brought in step with modern needs, too. The judges call up the White House and are instructed what decision modern needs demand.

The Leader's policy is to be paternal rather than severe. Two weeks before I left Washington, an organ grinder was caught playing *The Star Spangled Banner*. The Supreme Court, which often sits in police cases when magistrates are overburdened, heard the defendant. Chief Justice Blue explained to the Leader that the man did not understand what the tune signified, and the culprit was let off with twenty years. Another instance brings out this same strain of magnanimity. When a Philadelphian took out his handkerchief in a railroad station, a copy of the old horse-and-buggy Constitution fell to the floor. The fellow was shot at once, naturally. Later it was learned that an enemy had planted the Constitution in his pocket. The Leader sent a note of regret to the starving widow.

The country is becoming more like dear old Russia each hour. Religion is being dealt with firmly, but in some Catholic sections the Government is proceeding cautiously. Mass is still being said in Boston, San Francisco, Albuquerque and other places. Trends that would delight my old friends in Moscow are growing stronger every day. Back in 1941, I passed St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, watched the crowds emerging. Three weeks ago I walked by the same edifice. It is no longer St. Patrick's Cathedral. It is part of Radio City.

WITH SCRIP AND STAFF

THROWING SATAN OUT OF GEAR

WHEN the Holy Father, in his latest Encyclical, tells us that the Holy Rosary is a mighty weapon to use against the Evil Spirit in our days, he is stating a very old truth in a new form. Saint John the Evangelist saw an angel coming down from Heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And the angel "laid hold on the dragon the old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years."

I like to believe that the chain in the angel's hand was the Rosary, that little chain which is in the hands of innumerable little human beings. With these little chains we can each of us bind the dragon, and cast him, in our own way, into the bottomless pit, where he will meet that forgetfulness which his intolerably proud and vain nature so abhors. But how does the chaining process take place? I found an explanation in Paul Claudel. He says, in his *Présence de Dieu*, that the chain of the Rosary is an exact counterpart of that chain which ties us down so miserably, and keeps us from hearing the voice of God, the concatenation of empty, useless syllables forever passing like a stream through our mind.

"These are interior words," says Claudel, "this perpetual ferment within us of images, words, thoughts, remembrances, desires and motives, of germs and débris. . . . The Book of Exodus tells us that 'the river shall bring forth an abundance of frogs' (Ex. viii, 3). The river, one may say, is like the current of life. The frogs are the idle words caught in the eddies and the marshes at the shore, in that mud which is produced by the mind mixed with concrete reality; and they never stop raising their deafening note. . . . It is a harmful as well as an insistent clamor. . . . We need to pacify this agitation within us or at least to render it harmless little by little. This unrest, this continual straining against our own walls, this interior flight, this impatience of contact with God is what we must conquer, regulate, reduce."

And Claudel further asks, after he has pulled his beads out of his pocket: "What way is better to impose silence upon the frogs than to substitute rhythm for chaos, speech which profits for the speech 'which profiteth not' (Isaias, lviii, 8) and so by that very fact betrays its diabolical origin? When we put a brake, a regular cadence on our thoughts, we shut out all wanton elements from their circuit. The mind grows peaceful little by little. . . ."

Thus, says Claudel in another place, all that disturbing mental mechanism, that unbreakable chain of ideas, imaginations, recollections, movements of the intellect, the sense and the will is thrown out of gear, like the wheels of a bicycle when a boy

takes the chain off, and the "depths of the mind remain motionless and recollected, disjointed and half-dissolved distractions do no more than float lazily like a cloud, which else would be annoying, upon the surface of the mind. There is no more bond between them, there is no more chain, there is only an automatic enmeshing movement which unites them. In other words the Will and the Imagination have ceased to be united by their habitual bond." The chain has been taken from our neck as it was from the neck of the Prophet Jeremias. (Jer. xxviii, 10.)

There is, therefore, a psychology as well as a theology of the Rosary, and a philosophy also. The theology is found in the inexhaustible content of its prayers and the fifteen Mysteries of the Redemption that supply the material for contemplation, as well as its attractive symbolism.

The psychology lies in the power of the Rosary, through the device of rhythm and repetition, to induce in the mind and the sensitive organism that tranquillity which ascetics and mystics of all times have always found indispensable for the finite when it wishes to hearken to the Spirit of God.

Of old, the Fathers of the Desert induced this tranquillity by rhythmic prayers combined with a rhythm of bodily breathing or motion, as in the First Method of Prayer of Saint Ignatius Loyola. The Eastern Rites do not know the Rosary, but they excel us in the variety and fervor of their liturgical devotions in honor of Our Lady. Their repeated ektenes or litanies and other features of the Liturgy supply the rhythmic element, as do some of the pious practices recommended by the Eastern ascetics.

The philosophy, or let us say the Providence of the holy Rosary, lies in combining with the great Mysteries of the Redemption this simple yet subtle method by which the quiet of contemplation is made possible for the Marthas as well as the Marys of modern life. The Rosary's chain of prayers brings instant inner peace to the millions who have no outward peace, no cloister, no privacy, no surcease from the turmoil and distraction that ferment at the surface of things. The quick calm of the Rosary is the vestibule to the deeper and more exacting tranquillity of the liturgy itself, as a mother's hush upon her turbulent youngsters prepares them for silence in the presence of some venerable person, say the Bishop, who has come to visit them and looks for their undivided attention.

Now that with prison-reform and indirect lighting and wrist-watches and mechanical transportation most chains have passed out of our daily usage, it is a joy to slip your hand in your pocket of a winter afternoon and let your finger touch a chain that can bind the Primal Rebel of the Universe.

JOHN LAFARGE

A DEAD AMENDMENT

FROM the Court of Appeals, which is Kentucky's highest court, comes an interesting ruling on the Federal child-control Amendment. Briefly, the court declares that no Amendment of the kind is before the country or has been for some years!

This ruling may seem to argue a certain assurance in the Kentucky judges, but a glance at the text will dispel this conclusion. The court is speaking for Kentucky only, and speaking for the Commonwealth it declares that the alleged acceptance by the legislature in the earlier part of this year, is void.

Possibly this decision will be carried to the Federal courts, and in that case we may have certainty on a legal point which has never been clear. The Kentucky court reaches three conclusions: first, a State which has affirmed or rejected an Amendment cannot thereafter change its vote, unless the Amendment is again submitted by Congress; second, that the Amendment was actually defeated years ago when more than one-fourth of the States rejected it; and third, that more than the "reasonable time" proposed by the Supreme Court had elapsed between 1924, when the Amendment was submitted, and 1937, when the Kentucky legislature ratified it. The validity of any of these conclusions would negative Kentucky's ratification, but the court, possibly with a view to insuring certainty, assigns three extremely pertinent causes in the mortality return.

To refer once more to this device for centering control of the child in Congress may seem like threshing old straw. But it is not. The Amendment will be urged this winter upon every legislature which has either rejected or failed to act upon it, and it will be urged by a lobby which knows every pressure device as well as all the answers. An effort will be made to show the need of immediate ratification by presenting the topic to high-school and community forums and debating societies, and the wisdom of experienced publicity directors will be drawn upon to keep the subject constantly before the general public. If men and women who think this Amendment unwise and wholly unnecessary do not make their opinion known to their legislatures, Congress will soon be issuing rules and regulations for the guidance of about 40,000,000 young Americans. That will mean a regimentation hitherto known only in Russia.

No doubt the old argument that Congress will never use the vast powers which the Amendment authorizes will again make its appearance. It seems to survive the obvious answer that if Congress will never use these powers, there is no reason why they should be given. We cannot hope to escape, speaking in our editorial capacity, the familiar charge that what we really wish is to see every child of tender age at work in a coal pit or a steel mill. Although it is probably useless, we once more affirm that what we do *not* wish to see is our children working or not working at the order of a gang of politicians in Congress.

THE OFFICIAL VIEW

THAT veteran in the field of social security, Abraham Epstein, announced some weeks ago a course of lectures at New York University. Thereupon the head of the local Federal Security Board informed the University that since Mr. Epstein did not accept the conclusions favored at Washington, it would be well to add another lecturer "to give the official view." We think Mr. Epstein was justified in resenting this officious meddling. Neither on social security legislation nor on any other experiment which the Government may undertake is there an "official view" which citizens must accept.

AS WAR CLOUD

RECOGNIZING the essential accuracy of its analysis of world conditions, one reads the address of President Roosevelt at Chicago with approval and deep concern. The world has not yet recovered from the frightful disasters inflicted in the bloody period between 1914 and 1918, and yet throughout the world governments are preparing for another war. It would truly seem that the malice or folly of man is beyond all understanding.

Beyond any doubt, the President expressed the mind of an overwhelming majority of Americans when he said, "America hates war, America hopes for peace." More favored than other nations, we are less exposed to the dangers of war. We have nothing to gain, and everything to lose from war, and it was encouraging to note a decidedly anti-militaristic spirit in the meetings of the American Legion in its recent New York convention. As a people, we are definitely against war.

Yet may it not also be said of other nations that their people hate war and hope for peace? There has never been a war in history in which, after the first flush of war-hysteria had cooled, it was not found necessary to herd the men to the colors at the point of a bayonet. The vast majority of men do not want war. They have never wanted war. Yet for centuries the world has been scourged by war and everywhere the people groan under the lash.

The fundamental difficulty is, of course, that the people at large are unable to control their governments. Woodrow Wilson pointed to this

THE AMERICAN VIEW

IN this particular instance, no harm was done, since Mr. Epstein in courteous language invited the Board to turn its attention to its own business, if it had any. But suppose, asks Mr. Epstein, the University had been a poor institution with a petition before the Government for a grant in aid? In that case it would have been obliged to feature "the official view" and to suppress any views at variance with it. The Government's view may be right, and Mr. Epstein's may be wholly wrong. But must we take our views from Washington or be penalized when we refuse?

CLOUDS GATHER

fact when in the course of the World War he carefully distinguished between the German people and the German Government. This war, he said was a war to preserve democratic governments, to sanction the principle of open covenants openly arrived at, to make war undertaken at the order of a governing clique forever impossible. The irony of the situation was that President Wilson himself, elected on a platform of "he kept us out of war," was soon forced to prepare for war, and before eighteen months had passed, the American people, hating war, were engaged in a war from the effects of which we still suffer.

It can not be thought either that the President wilfully deceived the people during the campaign of 1916, or that he omitted any precaution which in his judgment was calculated to make war more remote. The unhappy fact is that our participation in the war was largely, perhaps wholly, due to what President Roosevelt describes as the impossibility of completely isolating ourselves "from economic and political upheavals which are experienced in other parts of the world."

The President gave no hint of how his proposed league of all peace-loving nations might be formed, except in passing references to treaties and agreements, most of which have already been minimized or set at naught. We pray that the Holy Spirit may guide him in his delicate task upon the happy conclusion of which the preservation of our Christian civilization may depend.

LABOR AND THE N.L.R.B.

IS it possible, we wonder, for John L. Lewis to reply to a request for the time of day, or "please pass the salt," except with a lowering brow and in a tone of thunder? We counsel him to spare his voice, and to relieve his brow from the furrows of unnecessary cares. Some of these days, Mr. Lewis is going to meet with phases of the work of the American Federation of Labor which he really disapproves. Unless he saves the roar and thunder of his anathemas for that occasion, the manner of his disapprobation will be singularly unimpressive.

As we have frequently stated since this internecine war began, we wish that the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. would bury the hatchet, and fill the pipe of peace. But we fear that our wish will not be fulfilled; at least not at a comfortably proximate date. Mr. Lewis roars his disapprobation of the A. F. of L. from platforms in the Middle West and along the Atlantic, and the A. F. of L., not deigning to reply in words, is preparing to expel from its membership all and sundry who are found infected with the heresy of the C. I. O. Possibly there is some stigma of disgrace in suffering expulsion, but as far as we can observe, the C. I. O. contingent does not appear to be bowed down with woe. By being kicked out of one bed, they are kicked into another.

The two factions are not able to agree on what both once hailed as labor's Magna Charta. It is true that the executive committee of the A. F. of L. comes out squarely against the amendment to the Wagner Act proposed by Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, but it is not satisfied with the manner in which the National Labor Relations Board has been interpreting the Act. According to spokesmen for the A. F. of L., the Board is bringing the Act into disrepute by interfering with contracts signed by the A. F. of L. and by acting as special counsel, upholding on every occasion the contentions of the C. I. O.

The chairman of the Board, J. Warren Madden, has indignantly denied the charge of partiality. As to assuming jurisdiction in disputes between the two organizations, he explains that this has been found necessary in only a few instances, and must not be taken as the fixed attitude of the Board's examiners. We can offer no solution which might reconcile these differences of opinion, but it seems to us that the A. F. of L. hit upon a point of tremendous importance when, in the report of the executive committee, it affirmed: "The administration of this Board is becoming more and more important." Fair, wholly impartial and intelligent administration is the test, we believe, by which the usefulness of this Board to labor and to the public is to be judged.

In a conflict between wage-earners and employers, most of us will probably assume that the worker is right and the employer wrong. In many, possibly in a majority of instances, the assumption will be justified. At the same time, most of us, were we appointed to sit in judgment upon the quarrel, would examine the case impartially. We would put

our prepossessions aside, and in forming our conclusions rely upon nothing but the evidence. If cross-examination seemed desirable as a means of clarifying testimony, we should not only permit but demand cross-examination. Briefly, we would wish to omit nothing which might help us to arrive at an accurate judgment.

It seems to us that some, at least, of the Board's examiners have not purged themselves of all bias before they began to investigate. To our purblind eyes, at least, it would seem that they assume from the outset that the employer is wrong. That assumption does great credit to their sensitive hearts, but less to their judgment. What is worse, since their judgment is subject to review by the courts, it may work great hardship upon the wage-earner who by the time the courts have acted, finds himself destitute. We may be in error, but it seems to us that some examiners have allowed themselves to be harried by counsel for employers into decisions that certainly will not be allowed on appeal. Capital can wait, but labor cannot.

We gladly concede that a desirable degree of solidarity for labor has been fostered by the Wagner Act, and we believe that when the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. forget their quarrel and present a common front to the enemy, this solidarity can be extended and strengthened. At the same time, we do not believe that the Wagner Act is perfect either in its provisions or in its administration. Both the Act and the Board should be carefully reviewed when Congress convenes.

BLUE EAGLES

LET us glance at that collector of blue eagles, Gen. Hugh Johnson. High in favor at the outset of the New Deal, General Johnson, it will be remembered, put a little Blue Eagle in every home in the country, except in that of Senator Glass, of Virginia. The bird signified that the dweller within was externally, if not inwardly, devoted to the New Deal.

In those hectic days, General Johnson used to recall to memory another doughty hero, Gen. Smedley Butler. General Butler had been charged with a task second in difficulty only to that of washing from our economic fabric the stains of injustice placed on it by buccaneering capitalists. He had the job of cleaning up Philadelphia.

Both these heroes were fond of noise and advertising. What General Butler is doing now we do not know, but General Johnson is explaining that if Mark Sullivan had given him in 1934 the advice he gave him last month, the New Deal would have swept its enemies from the field. Rather, it would have had no enemies. Mr. Sullivan's idea was: "Don't slap the States down, but cooperate with them."

But that plan did not originate with Mr. Sullivan. Whether it originated with this Review, modesty forbids us to say, but it furnished the text for many an editorial in AMERICA three years ago. General Johnson probably never saw them. All he then saw was blue eagles.

IN HIS IMAGE

TAXES have never been popular, but in the days of Our Lord there was a tax which was especially detested. It was only a kind of poll-tax, but in the minds of the people it was an open acknowledgment of Roman supremacy. Hence the Pharisees felt themselves safe when they sought to "ensnare Jesus in his speech" by asking Him: "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar?" If He said yes, He might have alienated the more nationalistic among His hearers. If He said no, the Pharisees would at once have accused Him before the Roman authorities (as later they actually did) of teaching that the people need not pay taxes.

In one splendid answer, recorded in tomorrow's Gospel (Saint Matthew, xxii, 15-21), Our Lord routs their craft, and lifts the question to a high level. He asks for a coin of the realm, and when they show Him a penny, He puts the question: "Whose image and superscription is this?" When they reply that it is Caesar's, He not only confounds their contemptible scheming, but announces a fundamental principle of life. "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

The text is often quoted as a sufficient answer when, as periodically happens, the civil loyalty of Catholics is questioned by fanatics. The questioners are either densely ignorant, or their purity of intention is on a par with that of the Pharisees. The slightest acquaintance with history will show that American Catholics have always been whole-heartedly loyal to the principles of this Government as set forth in the Constitution. Hence we may pass over this phase of our Gospel, and draw another moral.

It is our glory that the likeness stamped upon us as human beings is the likeness and image of God. This likeness is not only in the soul, man's spiritual part, but also in the body. As men and women, we are like to Him by Whose almighty fiat we came into being.

This likeness to God is a glory which we share in common. It brings the king upon his throne and the beggar in his hovel to the same plane. The tinsel of royal robes adds nothing to the one, and the squalor of the hovel takes nothing away from the other. In God's sight, both are stamped with His image.

The world will be a happier place when it realizes that truth. Its denial lies at the very root of our social and industrial ills, and is the occasion of countless moral disorders. The philosophy which argues that man differs from the brute only in degree and not in kind will be hard put to it to state a convincing proof that it is wrong for the industrialist to treat his employes as though they were beasts of burden.

Only when the world admits in every man an essential dignity in his likeness to God, a dignity which God Himself respects, can we destroy the injustice which has been established by a godless industrialism. On that foundation, but on no other, can we build an enduring Christian democracy.

CHRONICLE

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Roosevelt paid a four-hour visit to British Columbia. Shore batteries boomed a royal salute of twenty-one guns in his honor. . . . Mr. Roosevelt was motoring to Tacoma when Justice Black broadcast. The radio in the Presidential car was out of order, preventing the President from hearing the address. . . . Standing by the uncompleted Grand Coulee Dam, the President forecast a rush of thousands from the Bad Lands and the Dust Bowl, when the Dam's waters make the desert fertile. . . . In two Montana speeches, the President coupled the names of three Montana members of Congress, pointedly omitted the fourth, Senator Wheeler, who opposed his court plan. An important engagement kept Mr. Wheeler in California. . . . In Minnesota, Mr. Roosevelt again raised the Court issue. He asked for return of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act "destroyed" and "knocked out" by the Supreme Court. . . . In Chicago the President lunched with Cardinal Mundelein. . . . In Chicago also he delivered a speech which reverberated throughout the world. It sternly denounced nations which break treaties, wage undeclared wars, pledged his Administration to join other peace-loving nations in an effort to "quarantine" aggressor nations. White House attaches said the address was aimed at Japan, Italy and Germany. . . . The speech also drove the Justice Black affair off the front pages. Reaching Hyde Park, the President refused to comment on Justice Black's association with the Ku Klux Klan.

- - -

AT HOME. A threatened strike was averted when the railroads of the country agreed to give all engine, train and yard service employees a pay increase of forty-four cents a day. . . . Frank R. McNinch, of the Federal Communications Commission, intimated he would ask Federal regulation of radio broadcasting rates. . . . The Government deficit for the first quarter of the fiscal year was \$273,823,482, as compared with \$524,884,087 for the corresponding period last year. . . . Greenbelt, Md., the Government's \$14,000,000 community, was opened. . . . The Governors of nine Southeastern States announced a nation-wide campaign to encourage industrial expansion of the South. . . . High meat prices caused trouble. In New York, thousands of stores belonging to members of the Federation of Kosher Butchers were closed in a stoppage strike. Placards in the windows announced the stores were closed in protest against "the high cost of kosher meat and poultry." Throughout the country meat is seventeen per cent higher at retail markets than it was a year ago. Rising resentment at the mounting cost of living was reported. . . . The American Bar Association petitioned the United States Senate to hold public hearings on all future judicial ap-

pointments. Speaking to the Association, Congressman Hatton Sumners of Texas asked for a "battalion of death" to fight for constitutional government. . . . The fifty-seventh annual convention of the A. F. of L. was opened in Denver, October 4. In the same hall where he nominated John L. Lewis for the presidency in 1921, William Green declared the Federation would build "the greatest fighting machine that was ever created within the ranks of labor" to drive the C. I. O. out of existence.

- - -

WASHINGTON. In a formal statement issued October 6 by the State Department, the United States condemned Japan for her action in China, accused her of violating the Nine-Power treaty, the Kellogg-Briand pact. The declaration dropped the neutrality policy, aligned the United States with the League of Nations in the condemnation of Japan as an aggressor. . . . Justice Hugo L. Black's radio speech, admitting past membership in the Ku Klux Klan was criticized severely by newspapers scattered over the country. "Whole Conduct That of a Coward," "Plea of Man Caught With Goods," "Should Resign for Decency," were a few of the editorial titles. Mr. Black made no attempt to explain his silence while assurances were being given on the Senate floor that he had no connection with the Klan. . . . When the Supreme Court opened, October 4, Justice Black took his seat on the bench, watched former Assistant Attorney General Albert Levitt, and P. H. Kelly, Boston lawyer, submit motions denying him his seat. The motions contend the new justice is ineligible because when Senator he increased the emoluments of a Supreme Court justice, and that there is no vacancy on the bench. . . . Chief Justice Hughes said the motions would be considered.

- - -

SINO-JAPANESE WAR. Little change was noted in the Shanghai sector. Bayonet-wielding Chinese overpowered a Japanese thrust in the North Station area. Japanese artillery continued hammering the Chinese position attempting to crack the line extending from north Shanghai to the Yangtze River. On a five-mile front near Liuhang, Japanese said they had pushed into the Chinese lines to a depth of 1,000 yards, captured thirty-six small villages. The casualties continued heavy on both sides. . . . The war was costing the Chinese Government about \$1,000,000 daily. . . . Through Shanghai's streets and alleys roamed hundreds of half-clad orphans hunting for food. . . . Chinese junks were sunk by Japanese warships. Hundreds were reported drowned. . . . Three more Japanese air raids terrorized Nanking. . . . In the North, Japanese forces crossed the border into Shantung Province.

SPAIN. A torpedo fired from an unidentified submarine narrowly missed the British destroyer, Basilisk, off the coast of Spain. . . . In the North, General Franco raced with winter as his columns pushed through chilling rains, occasional snow and Asturians' bullets, closer to Gijon. Historic Covadonga fell into Nationalist hands. Asturian defenders were routed from six 5,000-foot peaks, and Asturian defenses around Cangas de Onis were crumbling under Nationalist thrusts. . . . In Valencia, the Cortes registered a vote of confidence in the Negrin Government. The Syndicalist Deputy, Angel Pestana, voiced sharp criticism, and Francisco Largo Caballero, former Premier, remained away. . . . Bruno Mussolini, twenty-year-old son of Premier Mussolini, was flying for Franco, a report declared.

— — —

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. The League of Nations Far Eastern Advisory Committee, in a unanimous resolution, condemned Japan as an invader and treaty-breaker, and expressed "its moral support for China." The Committee urged that League members refrain from action which might weaken China's powers of resistance, and should also consider how far they could extend aid to China. Britain had opposed giving China anything more than moral support, until word of President Roosevelt's Chicago speech was received. She then changed, urged the stronger resolution. This resolution authorized League members who are parties to the Nine-Power treaty to invite the United States and other interested powers to arrange a conference and end the Sino-Japanese conflict by agreement. Intimations that an invitation from Washington to hold the meeting there would be most welcome were heard. . . . The League of Nations Assembly adopted the resolution of the Far Eastern Committee. . . . The League Assembly voted for its political commission's Spanish war resolution, with fourteen delegations not voting.

— — —

ITALY. Britain and France pressed for a reply to their joint note asking re-examination of the entire Spanish non-intervention question. The Italian Foreign Office still studied the matter, preparatory to answering. . . . *La Tribuna*, newspaper, interpreted President Roosevelt's Chicago speech as applying to Communist Russia. Signor Virginio Gayda, of the *Giornale d'Italia*, declared official statistics show the volume of Russian exports to Leftist Spain during the first eight months of this year was twenty-seven times more than in the corresponding period of last year. Part of the goods were supplied free.

— — —

GREAT BRITAIN. Prominent Protestants have formed the United Christian Front Committee to help in the struggle against the Red menace to Christianity in Spain. Captain Archibald H. M. Ramsay, M.P., is the committee's chairman. Lord Ruthven, several Anglican Bishops and clergymen,

one a former headmaster of Eton, Sir Henry Lunn, and other prominent figures are on the committee. Referring to the fallacies which have deceived portions of the British public, the committee statement says: "The phrase 'It is six of one and a half dozen of the other,' has been a clever piece of Red propaganda which has obscured the facts—and is not true in this case." The statement refutes the charge that Protestant churches have been suppressed in Franco territory, and declares Franco's rising was just in time to avert an atheistic dictatorship. It calls for a united front of all Christian men against the anti-Christ movement in Spain, Russia and elsewhere. . . . Court circles were annoyed at the Duke of Windsor's projected trip to Germany and the United States to study housing and labor conditions. . . . Fear that Japan might retaliate against British exports, slowed down the boycott movement. . . . By a vote of 2,116,000 to 331,000, the British Labor party rejected the proposal to form a united front with Communists. However, two united front champions were elected to the party's executive committee.

— — —

FRANCE. With the franc hitting an eleven-year low, the French Cabinet altered the course the Popular Front Government had been pursuing since it came into power fifteen months ago. Psychological and political causes, not financial or economic, made the franc dip, the Cabinet declared. Illegalities, such as the occupation of factories and the breaking of collective contracts, must stop. Something must be done about the forty-hour week, which does not seem to be producing satisfactory results. Finance Minister Georges Bonnet warned the country that his budget figures and the franc could not be maintained unless French capital and labor made an effort to increase production. The Government rejected the idea of exchange control.

— — —

FOOTNOTES. In Russia, dismissals, arrests, executions continued. Eight more grain-trust employes were shot; twenty comrades in Irkutsk were executed for hooliganism, three for spoiling grain. Moscow zoo employes got into hot water. One accusation was, allowing tacks in bread for guinea hens, permitting strychnine in sausages given badgers, slaughtering and eating the bears and water buffalos. The President, Vice-President and six other officials of the Adjara Republic of the USSR were shot. . . . In Germany, Hitler made taunting references to the Christian churches. He assailed the nations which refuse to return the former German colonies. Referring to the Roosevelt speech, the semi-official *Diplomatische Korrespondenz* asks Mr. Roosevelt to consider the fate of President Wilson and not start something he cannot finish. The paper said Mr. Roosevelt failed to recognize Bolshevism's threat to world peace. . . . Premier Mitchell Hepburn was reelected in Ontario, Canada. . . . The Palestine Government exiled high Arab leaders. . . . India celebrated the sixty-eighth birthday of Mohandas K. Gandhi, October 2.

CORRESPONDENCE

OVER-CROWDED PARISHES

EDITOR: During the course of the past year letters and articles appeared in AMERICA anent leakage from the Church. Many were the causes given, mixed marriages, I believe, being the predominant one.

Never, however, have I seen what I believe to be the incipient cause—overpopulated parishes.

I can recall offhand five parishes in New York having from 5,000 to 10,000 parishioners each, and two in Massachusetts having 25,000 apiece. In the former case there are not more than four priests to a rectory, in the latter, five. What is the result? There are Masses every half hour of a Sunday, from six o'clock to twelve-thirty; one crowd bustles out while another hustles in; the Epistle is omitted to save time, the sermon, too, from June to September. "Too hot to preach."

The real result: Mass Catholics *en masse*—a twentieth-century species; many reck naught of breaking the Commandments, but they will break their necks in a wild endeavor to get to Mass. "And when the sun was up they were scorched; and because they had not root, they withered away." The true Shepherd said: "I know mine and mine know me." Can a pastor and four assistants possibly know, spiritually, more than a third of the parish when it runs into 20,000 souls?

Belleville, Ill. JAMES E. NOONAN, O.M.I.

WAR BUDGET

EDITOR: I wish to express my great approval of Mr. Deverall's article, *Europe Races to New Wars* (AMERICA, September 25). There is urgent need for articles on peace in these days when war and the rumors of war cover the front pages of our daily papers.

There is a point which I would like to make, however, which suggests itself from the statistics which he presented on Europe's annual war expenditures. He says: "These countries are spending, in the course of the year, no less than fifteen billions of dollars. . . . Moscow's military budget calls for an annual expenditure of \$12,000,000,000." This means that Russia, the nation that talks peace, is spending yearly eighty per cent of all the money being spent in Europe for armament.

Our newspapers do not bring out this startling fact: we are constantly informed as to how militaristic are Germany and Italy. England's expenditures "for defense" are publicized, but Russia's huge war budget is passed over. Even Mr. Deverall did not give it the prominence it deserved. Julio Alvarez Del Vayo, Spanish Loyalist delegate to the League of Nations, on the floor called Germany

and Italy "this two-headed monster which appears to want to declare war on all Europe."

Let us not be deceived. Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris*, has sounded the solemn warning. Russia wants war as part of her system, but only when the nation she wars upon is unprepared. Revolution is her solemn right and duty. Can it not be that nations other than Russia are at the present time spending too little on armament?

Detroit, Mich.

ERWIN A. LEFEBVRE

SPANISH AID

EDITOR: I was recently present at a gathering of women who, not inquiring as to my convictions, presumed I was as sympathetic to the Loyalist cause in Spain as they were. I was amazed, therefore, to learn of their activities. One was planning a lawn party, another a musical and another an indoor bridge party. The proceeds of these affairs were to be sent to Spain to support the Loyalist army. As far as I could gather, these women acted without instructions from any special source; each one's plans was the result of personal initiative. Each was a woman of moderate circumstances to whom such crowded festivities were unusual and fatiguing. Yet each strove individually to do her share.

I thought of the America Spanish Relief Fund conducted for the people of Spain who are suffering from the continued warfare. I wondered how many Catholic women's clubs were doing anything for these sufferers which would approximate the efforts of these women who turned physical energy and time into cash which they could not personally afford to give.

I recommend this thought to every woman's club in the United States. Is it not possible to get together and add voice and cash to the Truth which we know?

Long Island, N. Y.

F. F. W.

MASARYK

EDITOR: President Masaryk never denied the existence of a personal God. At the time of his pre-War visits to the United States, in an informal discussion following one of his speeches here in Cleveland, he was asked: "And now, Professor, will you please tell us that there is no God?" Masaryk replied: "I have not as yet reached that conclusion."

On three occasions I heard from his own lips that he believed in a personal God and that he could clearly discern the guidance of Divine Provi-

dence in his own life. The Czecho-slovak General Medek, who married one of Masaryk's granddaughters, told me of an episode that occurred in the later years of Masaryk's life. It happened at Lany. The President was amusing himself in the company of children when one of his granddaughters inadvertently made a slurring remark about a certain passage in Sacred Scripture. Masaryk took her by the hand and said: "You must never say that. The Bible is the most sacred book in the world." It is interesting to note that whenever he took leave of anyone he always used the Catholic formula of farewell: "*S Pánem Bohem* (God be with you)." This form of farewell, so typical of Masaryk, became very popular among his friends.

As the leader of the movement for national freedom, he sought the cooperation of Bohemian Catholics throughout the United States; and during his stay at Chicago in May, 1918, he was approached by the delegates of the National Alliance of Bohemian Catholics and asked what policy he would pursue in the government of the newly founded Czecho-slovak State. He replied: "In Czecho-slovakia there will be no confiscation of Church property; there will be perfect religious freedom." He kept his word literally.

The recently ratified *modus vivendi* between the Vatican and the Czecho-slovak Republic is not only the result of the great influence of Bohemian and Slovak Catholics, but also the recognition of the good will and influence of Masaryk and his successor in office, President Benes.

Cleveland, Ohio MSGR. OLDRICH ZLAMAL

APPEAL

EDITOR: Here in Ceylon I am editing a monthly magazine called *Social Justice*. Its object is to put forth the Catholic social program and fight the menace of Communism. I am working under great difficulties. I am anxious to get the best literature available in English and French on the social question. Will any of your readers be kind enough to mail to me their copies of *AMERICA* and other periodicals?

I am also directing Catholic Action groups, but am hampered by lack of literature in English. Perhaps some benefactor interested in Catholic Action in mission lands might like to get in touch with me and hear about my needs.

My address is St. Peter's College, Bambalapitiya, Colombo, Ceylon.

Bambalapitiya REV. PETER PILLAI, O.M.I.

A PROTESTANT PROTESTS

EDITOR: As an Episcopal clergyman on the staff of Calvary Church, I wish to express my personal chagrin at the Open Letter recently printed in the papers denouncing the Spanish Hierarchy and signed by 150 Protestant clergymen. May I say that these men by no means speak for all of us in the Protestant Churches. My own conviction, and that

of many others with whom I am in contact, is that the real danger in the world today lies in the atheistic, materialistic philosophies, militantly attacking eternal Christian truth, and in those who are unwittingly duped by them. Many of us Protestants say a hearty "Amen" to the official stand taken by the Roman Catholic Church on the fundamental moral issues which she has so intransigently upheld.

It seems to me that the world is at too sick a stage for those of us who see the real enemy not to make common cause in the name of God and Our Lord Jesus Christ. In this connection, I should like to call attention to an article in the *Catholic World* for September by Dr. Christian Richard suggesting lines of cooperation between Catholics and Protestants and what he calls "all other serious-minded people or humanists." It seemed to me a penetrating analysis of the situation and a hopeful harbinger of the answer.

New York, N. Y. REV. JOHN P. CUYLER, JR.

DISCERNMENT OF SPIRITS

EDITOR: I see by the papers that Father Talbot, Father LaFarge and Mr. John O'Connor replied to the outrageous defense of the Spanish priest-murderers signed by the bevy of "liberal" Protestant clergymen, laymen and a number of agnostic agitators.

The reply of our Catholic defenders of the Faith consisted in politely pointing out to the Libertarians that they were wrong on *matters of fact*.

I respectfully submit the personal conviction that it is not matters of fact that our liberalistic friends are wrong on. Their error is an error of the moral will and is not merely an error of statistical deduction.

Communists and liberals and other such gentlemen defend their creeds with "facts and statistics." We Catholics, on the other hand, possess the gift of discernment of spirits.

The anti-Franco liberals have not failed in matters of fact. They were confronted with this choice: Shall we support the Spanish parties of social reform even though they are anti-Christian? Or shall we support the Christian Church in Spain, even though the Church's adherence to social reform is questionable?

Messrs. Fosdick, Ward, *et al.* definitely chose social reform in preference to Christianity.

If it comes to a head-on conflict between Christianity and social reform, these gentlemen choose their true religion, social reform, even though the Spanish social reformers definitely intend the extirpation of Christianity.

You can't refute such a position by giving these social reform gentry a table of statistics and cold facts.

Because their failure is not a failure of factual apperception. It's a definite enmity to Christ's Church carried on with full sight and complete consent.

New York, N. Y.

DAVID GORDON

LITERATURE AND ARTS

RED RETREAT: A SPIRITUAL REFLECTION

JOSEPH P. MERRICK, S.J.

EVENING it is and crimson, and the day is now far spent. Slowly the three families of pilgrims curve into view through the ravine-pass and push their trudging way up the steep escarpment, twisting, unwinding, now and then filling the ruddy amphitheatre with liturgical song. The average American mother could never in the literal sense make this grade. The average Chaldean grandame would be appalled if she could not.

Whence are these Christian palmers and whither do they go? Usually from Alqosh, on the edge of the plain to the southwest less than an hour on foot, or from any of the Chaldean Catholic villages that dot the plain south to Mosul (Nineveh) or, rarely, from distant climes and in non-native dress. They go to spend the evening with the Hearts of Christ and His Blessed Mother at the Church of Our Lady of the Harvest near the tomb of Rabban Hormuz. A bit of flour, a melon or two, a small earthen jar, perhaps a sleeping mat and the clothes they wear—that is all they need for a week. There are several monastery wells near the Church and firewood for the baking of bread and the slaking of thirst. Even so did the more than million Jews trek into Jerusalem in the days of the Loss and Finding of the Boy Jesus and in the week of His Passiontide.

The morrow would be the seventh day of my retreat, the drear red Day of Death before the sun of Easter. It had been easier than ever to meditate on Christ's Life and Passion in this year of grace, 1937. The meditation on the Last Supper—the Eucharist and the Mass—was just finished and now was the time of the flaming flow of the Agony and Passion. To place these simple people in the Passion picture was easy. They were those who, all unknowing, in their tiny groups on roofs, in closets, or by Temple stones prayed with Christ during His red Sweat while apostles slept; they were those who wept as He bled His torturing way to Calvary. They were those who in the words of St. Paul "filled up what was wanting in the sufferings of Christ." Chaldeans—whose Babylonian madness once kindled fiery furnaces for Jewish saints, but now their martyr blood bears witness that they

have been for generations the spiritual successors both in faith and language, liturgy and fortune, of the Jews they slew.

The Good Samaritan who took care of bleeding travelers near the cavern of the Forty Days Fast was of their race; and the last retreat of Christ, the mortal, from Palm Sunday to the Holy Sepulchre was initiated by their Hosannas and not broken by their *Crucifige*. They were kinsmen to the whites of Spain and they were with them, soul to soul.

So often that minds remembered not, had the red wave of massacre broken over them. Yet people said, and I, believing them, that the Christians of Iraq were going Communist. One short summer month visiting the Christian hovels of Baghdad had shown me just how absolutely false the statement was. Some of those who had ridden loftily to cheap officialdom, the would-be bourgeoisie, infallible pontificators from high school chairs, hedonists, determinists, Deweyites and like kidney, to whom God was little and religion less—they were the pinks and reds but cowards. The really poor, the staunch majority, were really pious and they treated me as Christ's emissary. One thing only they asked: "Visit us often, Father, we love to have you come. Don't visit only the rich."

This is a bloody, diabolic age, where God seems dead or dying. If the vision of any hour of the future gave Christ in Gethsemani more pain than the vision of this, it must have been incomprehensibly wicked. And yet the whole Catholic world seems to be pulsating with a new and deeper life. For the crucial hour is passed. It was exactly a year ago, on July 18, when I was going into the seclusion of this monastery of caves, that from his meditations in retreat in the Canaries and in the Moslem land of Morocco the Spanish eagle had leapt the African wave. The religious fate of Europe was in his hands. Constantine, Joan of Arc, John Sobieski and John of Austria, Weygand—he was heir to them all. *Gesta Dei per Franco* were the lightning flashes of a new era, an upsurge of the Church of Christ from Spain to the ends of the earth. Spain diabolically red was to yield to Spain crusadingly white.

This was perhaps the way the prophecy of Venerable Bernard de Hoyos was to be proven true. Had not the Sacred Heart of Jesus said: "I will reign in Spain and more there than elsewhere." So His reign was to be a renewal of His reign from Good Friday to Easter Sunday. Spanish altars defiled and ruined. Priests and nuns and every sacred person or thing left to the degenerate unmercy of men possessed of devils. As God is God, diabolism was at the helm. Were the priesthood of Spain ten times as bad as its traducers said it was, a merely human hatred of it could never have been so vicious. But "ought not Christ suffer these things and so enter into His glory? If I be lifted up, behold I will draw all things to myself." Passion of Christ and passion of the Mystical Body of Christ, strengthen me.

My silent evening recreation is over. It is time for me to prepare points for my morning meditation on the Agony in the Garden. The stars are coming out like prophets that foretell the coming of the moon. Below the guardian mastiff barks faithfully and to the answering echo barks again. Untroubled by the troubled eyes that shine upward from the terraced roofs, white and quiet are the stars. And men's eyes close. The stars die down while Jesus walks helpless into the Garden a stone's throw and prays alone, bathed in moonlight and in Blood.

ERNEST HELLO

IN my own opinion, as a mediocre man, Ernest Hello (1828-1885) is the profoundest Catholic mind of the modern era. But Saint Jean-Baptiste Vianney, the Curé d'Ars, who was anything but a mediocre man, said: *Le bon Dieu a donné à M. Hello la génie; Je veux l'embrasser: moi, le pauvre curé.* It is high time that he were better known outside of France. I have made an extensive research and can find nothing of his translated into English.

The character of Hello is radically different from that of the other prominent Catholic writers of nineteenth century France. He is not as melodramatic as his friend Bloy, but he is far deeper, and he is, unlike Bloy, disentangled from his own shabby Ego. Again he is not, as were Baudelaire, Barbey d'Aurevilly, Villiers de Lisle Adam, Rimbaud, Verlaine (and today's François Mauriac) constantly fighting his own crude internal battle with sex and sin. When we see Hello in print, he has already conquered a personal life of high and Christian serenity "above the battle," so that he can devote his rhetoric to his thesis. Claudel, with his subtle biblicism and his quiet plangency, among modern Catholic writers, resembles him most. Among the saints, he is most reminiscent of Francis de Sales. He has Francis' great knowledge of man's heart, he has his depth, and he has, too, a tremendous learning both sacred and profane, reminding one of an Augustine or a Bellarmine. He translated Angela de Foligno from the Italian and Frederick William Faber from the English. He brought his favorite Psalms into French from their

original Hebrew. Ernest Hello is *par excellence* a psychologist; some of his "psychographs" of the saints are of a masterly beauty and subtlety; for character-drawing of the personalities of sacred history he uses Balzac's relentless, soul-searching method.

It is especially needful that Ernest Hello be known to Catholic hearts in Protestant America. For the Catholic in America has a tendency to be protestantized by his environment. Most of us in this country could serve as the archetype of Hello's *Homme Médiocre* (there can be no such thing as a *Catholique Médiocre* he said elsewhere, since Catholic Christianity is radical in its very nature) who goes sleepily through his external observances but at heart is sold hide, hair and soul to the religion of modern America.

And what is the religion of modern America? Surely it is Liberalism and prosperity! Christ in His Church teaches grimly: "My Kingdom is not of this world." The religion of modern America is a desperate struggle for the Kingdom of this world. The dogmas of liberal Americanism (which includes, by way of the United Front, Marxist Americanism) are prosperity, culture and happy feelings. The ultimate beatitude of liberal America is a chicken in every "worker's" pot and a college education in Art appreciation for every "worker's" daughter. The liberal American insists that he is a pacifist: but if you tell him that it is of faith with you, as a Catholic, that even economic prosperity cannot be achieved by purely economic means—that to make men happy you must tackle their individual souls—to scotch such a contention your liberal American is ready to go to war and shed blood in defense of his religion of Economic Determinism.

Perhaps the most typical example of the religion of modern America is the Rev. Sherwood Eddy, Methodist minister, Socialist and Contraceptionist, who has preached his gospel of Marxism-cum-Contraception all over America and (he is a Y. M. C. A. missionary) in many lands of Asia.

Now the tragedy among American Catholics is that so many of us have succumbed to the atmosphere in which we live. We believe in the great mysteries of our Faith in a "mediocre" way, whilst passionately devoting our lives and energies to the task of learning "how to win friends and influence people." Armed with such sentiments, may God help us if there comes a black day among us, as such a day has come to Catholic Germany, when there is a dictatorship in Washington, dictating in the name of some wild ideology, and confronting us with this horrible alternative: Enforced Liberalism, or Christ's Church and Her Teaching and Her Schools.

DAVID GORDON

(N. B. Next week we shall have the privilege and pleasure of publishing Mr. Gordon's excellent translation of Ernest Hello's *L'Homme Médiocre*. We feel that this article will be of exceptional interest to the readers of AMERICA. The essay appeared in the year 1869 in *L'Univers*, and was reprinted in Hello's book of essays called *L'Homme*. L. F.)

BOOKS

GLOOMY AND CONFUSED WERE HIS LAST YEARS

KARL MARX: MAN AND FIGHTER. By Boris Nikolaievsky and Otto Maenchen-Helfen. J. B. Lippincott Co. \$3.50

KARL MARX: THE STORY OF HIS LIFE. By Franz Mehring. Covici-Friede. \$5

THESE two works appeared about the same time, and both are translations from the German. Mehring's book was first published in 1918. A new edition was issued in 1933, after Mehring's death. His work is called the "definitive life of Karl Marx," and has admirable summaries of Marxian theory. The other biography is somewhat more modern and lively in style, contains many recent discoveries, such as the Imperial Russian influence in the suppression of Marx' *Rheinische Zeitung*, and throws intimate light on Marx' strategy. For both authors, Marx is an unquestioned hero, whose transcendent qualities fully justify the intolerable egotism and dictatorial qualities described in him by his contemporaries, such as the Russian Annenkov. From the moral angle, one might as well ask a devout Hindu to criticize the youthful Krishna for his vagaries with the Gopi maidens.

Enemy of the Faith proclaimed by the Old Testament prophets, Marx, bearded, Jewish and vocal, did share their incredible tenacity of purpose, inspired not by illumination from above, but by an uncanny intuition from below as to the manner in which human passions could be swayed. His life was prophetic of what is happening today. Like his most successful contemporary followers, he waged many of his fiercest battles not with the bourgeoisie, but with the extreme Left-wingers of the revolutionary movement, headed by the Russian anarchist Bakunin. The ideological descendants of Karl Marx contend in Barcelona and Valencia today, in the persons of Negrin and his Moscow directors, against the ideological descendants of Bakunin through the "martyred" Ferrer, in the persons of the Spanish Anarchists and Syndicalists.

In Nikolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen's story of Marx' youth and early studies, we find exemplified the inner kinship of revolutionary extremism with the non-spiritual "might-is-right" philosophies that are used to bolster up extreme conservatism. His professor at Bonn, for instance, the distinguished jurist Savigny, taught natural rights as an empty abstraction, which "boiled down in practice to a simple sanctification of everything handed down from the past. The ideologist of the Christian-German state had discerned the revolutionary implication of the philosophy of Hegel at a time when the ruling powers still regarded it as absolutism's strongest possible support." The blunders of King Frederick William IV of Prussia, who tried to combat neo-Hegelianism by Schelling's philosophy of the police-state, opened the door to the revolutionary ideas of the Young Hegelians who had been raised not in Siberian prisons but in the comfortable, mildly Voltairean bourgeois atmosphere of benevolent Masonic liberalism.

Of all his intuitions, none is more remarkable, in the light of recent events, than Marx' bold assumption that the primary means for handling the bourgeoisie was not to put yourself at their mercy by conspiracies and underground plots, but by embracing them with the ultimate object of murdering them when they should have served their purpose. For even though the bourgeoisie knew perfectly well that was your ultimate aim, they would suffer your embrace just the same, as long as you offered them immediate flattery and aid.

Karl Marx was indescribably industrious; he hated the

Russians; deplored the British lack of "generalizing spirit and revolutionary passion"; believed in the Germans; was shocked by Mazzini and Italian nationalism; was perplexed by the Jews; was fond of foolishness of his children; adored his aristocratic, religion-hating wife; scouted pacifism and believed that "each war should be judged on its own merits"; detested class peace and social reforms that did not further his own plans; was tolerant of groups whose programs he inwardly despised; saw police-spies in conspirators; thought the Paris Commune with its murder of Archbishop Darboy was the greatest event to date in history; called the minimum wage a "childish bit for the French proletariat"; quarreled with most of his friends including Engels, and got on best with the poet Freiligrath. His last years were gloomy and confused.

With the last shreds of religious faith destroyed by David Strauss' *Life of Jesus* the achievement of his life had been to change Socialism which at the beginning meant merely "sympathy with the suffering mass, appeal to man's nobler instincts and belief in a better world," and Communism which had been little more than a resolute opposition to "poverty, hunger and distress" into a world movement of organized class hatred.

JOHN LAFARGE

DEATH STRUGGLE WITH LONDON BANKERS

NAPOLEON, THE PORTRAIT OF A KING. By R. McNair Wilson. Longmans, Green and Co. \$3.50

EACH age sees the past through its own eyes. The kind of history we like to read, and consequently the kind of history a wide-awake historian will write, can be taken as a fairly accurate index of our mentality. At the present moment, when a dozen "Napoleons," little and great, are strutting daily in the news of the world, one is not surprised to find a dozen or more studies of the Corsican Colossus on our new book shelves. And in quality, importance and human interest they deserve their place. In fact they have to be well above the low average of contemporary publications to attract the curious reader, and it is easier to recommend most of them than it is to give a passing vote to hundreds of their rivals.

We are interested in dictators. With so many of them contending for the lime-light it would be hard to be indifferent. A distracted world is hungering for leadership, and so long as the need continues to call forth Stalins, Hitlers, Mussolinis and Roosevelts, a greater genius than any of them will remain a popular theme for the historian's art. But the author of the biography under review offers an added stimulus to the reader's attention. His Napoleon was a master of finance, locked in a death struggle with London bankers, successful for a short decade, ultimately strangled by them. They, and not he drenched the fair fields of Europe with the blood of millions. Their gold hired the princes and princelings of Europe and even the traitors in France to thwart the liberating efforts of a man of the people. Moscow, Leipzig, Waterloo and St. Helena tell of the tragedy of a military career, but it was the money power that triumphed in the victories of Wellington and a resurgent national feeling.

The whole story is plausible enough, though Dr. Wilson's thesis—and emphatically it is a thesis—will not be readily accepted without qualification. By dint of omissions and favorable constructions he overdraws the all but flawless altruism of his hero. The book will make

pleasant reading for anyone, but it should not be accepted as a complete biography of Napoleon. It will, however, if read in conjunction with other recent books, help to correct anti-Napoleonic distortions. It will certainly throw light on the money-lending liberals who have had things very much their own way since the downfall of the "tyrant" who threatened to end their tyranny.

Dr. Wilson has written biographies of Josephine, Germaine de Staël and Napoleon's mother. In *Napoleon* all of these are cast in important rôles, the flabby Josephine contrasting strongly with the virile Letizia, and the daughter of Necker doing the villain's work as ubiquitous ambassadress for the bankers. They and the other members of the Bonaparte family make the hero appear human, at times too human. Dr. Wilson has also written *Monarch or Money Power*, which might well serve as a sub-title for his *Napoleon*. He claims expert knowledge of money problems. And he flays mercilessly "the power, the resource, the treachery and the cruelty of finance with its infinite capacity to corrupt, to play off one institution against another, to befog men's minds with false politics, false economics, false science, and false religion, above all to prevent, by a ceaseless vigilance, the blessing of true leadership."

His documentation is abundant, though not always adequate, and it loses much of its value by being relegated to the end of the volume. He leans heavily on the Caulaincourt Memoirs, but he is not "the first to make use" of them.

R. CORRIGAN

HISTORY BY AN EYE-WITNESS

Forty Years of American Life. By Thomas Nichols. *Stackpole Sons.* \$3

BROAD and charming was the land through which sharp-eyed Dr. Nichols passed; clear and charming is the style in which he describes this land, its cities and peoples. Much travelled, sharply observant, widely acquainted, Thomas Low Nichols writes with facile pen about his travels when America was young, recounts his observations and reveals his contemporaries.

Forty years of American Life, then, is not an autobiography; it is something better. It is the happy resurrection of a work written over seventy years ago by an American, but for an English public. Americans are permitted to see their early selves as they were shown with remarkable impartiality to British cousins. The thoroughly American author had seen his country, and understood his countrymen. In 1861, when his Northern neighbors made war on his Southern friends in order to enforce fraternal union, he preferred freedom in England to fanaticism in the States, so he crossed the ocean and wrote of the land he left behind. Fortunately for Englishmen of that day and for Americans of current times, this self-exiled Yankee composed uniformly interesting chapters on American life between 1821 and 1861.

The personages, customs, conveniences, movements parading before the reader are just as outmoded as horse-cars, just as modern as tomorrow. All of the characters that live in his pages, Horace Greeley, Henry Clay, James Gordon Bennett, Beecher, Poe, Jackson, William Lloyd Garrison, have long joined the dead; but many of the experiments popular in our day were so in his. "Some went so far in their fight with civilization as to go without clothes"—nudism. "The *Tribune* became a sort of Fourier Joint-Stock Association in which editor, contributors, clerks and printers were shareholders"—employe ownership. "Divorce laws of several States, under which married people can be released from their bonds for almost any reason—for desertion or alleged incompatibility of temper—to marry again and be again divorced when the caprice seizes them" reads more like up-to-the-minute marital morality than grounds for family disruption legalized seventy-five years ago.

The author furnished his cramped foreign readers with a panoramic view of the vast U.S.A. (as it then was) and also gave them a good peep into American politics (as they still are). One chapter is an abridged album of presidential pen portraits. In a few incisive lines Dr. Nichols limns the Presidents from cultured Monroe to uncultured Grant. In early chapters the voluble, visitor-author praised our cities to the skyline, but small is the praise meted out to our Presidents. Probably the booming cities of youthful America did have more to their credit than our First Citizens.

This honest expositor must have stunned the far less biased Englishmen when he revealed the depths of American prejudice against the Negro, a prejudice unsoftened by time. The complementary essay on slavery unfolds the view of an understanding man. It is impossible to read this excellent chapter without profit—or the book without instructive entertainment.

ARTHUR E. GLEASON

BOOKS IN BRIEF REVIEW

OLEANDER RIVER. By G. B. Stern. *The Macmillan Co.* \$2.50

HERE is another English novel written according to one of the popularity prescriptions. There is nothing bad about the book if one does not object to the standard devices for releasing the reader from reality: in the story every day is sunny, all the characters are young or handsome or, at any rate, happy, everyone has money enough for whatever he needs or desires, the humor is not too subtle, the clever bits are so labored that it is impossible to miss them, there is a romantic dash of quaint and colorful Catholicism just as there is a dash of the most democratic aristocracy. Not one of the disturbing matters of daily living is allowed to enter between the covers.

The story is, of course, a triangle and the three main characters are the girl, Gil, her contemporary, Piers, and his father, Sir Dominic. Piers loves Gil and Gil loves Dominic. There are many other persons in the story, every one as familiar as though cut from an old pattern. The sad part of it is that this novel, which seems too transparent even to attract Hollywood notice, will be well reviewed and widely read.

THE CITADEL. By A. J. Cronin. *Little, Brown and Co.* \$2.50

THE ENCONIUMS on the jacket, and Dr. Cronin's enviable reputation for his previous novels, had led to such a pleasurable anticipation that the actual reading of this latest work proved to be quite a disappointment. It is practically a violent denunciation of the profession of medicine as practised in the British Isles. If English and Scotch physicians are anything like the dishonest politicians portrayed by the author, it is little wonder that he has given up his practice for the more agreeable and profitable task of a novelist.

The Annual Conferences of the British Medical Union are described as offering sporting, social and scientific enjoyments to members and their families, reduced terms in all but the best hotels, free charabanc trips to any ruined Abbey in the neighborhood, a memento art brochure, souvenir diaries from the leading Surgical Appliance Makers and Drug Houses, and pumproom facilities at the nearest spa.

The story is concerned with a young doctor who starts out in practice with the highest hopes of benefiting mankind, but soon finds that his care of patients is always handicapped by the outrageous bungling of those on whom his cases depended for treatment. Appointments for which he strove, proved to be directed, not to the use for which the British public gave their hard-earned money, but were merely to boost the reputation of some

member of Parliament. It is impossible, however, to imagine that such an ignorant and incompetent surgeon as a "Dr. Ivory" is shown to be, could possibly have any patients on whom to operate.

The best part of the book is the climax, and the best incident in it—though explainable evidently to the scientific mind by the emotional strain following a terrible calamity—is the picture of the doctor driven by his desperate condition to acknowledgment of his need of the help of Almighty God.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FASCISM. By Mario Palmieri. *The Dante Alighieri Society*, 410 S. Michigan Boulevard, Chicago. \$2.50

THE author of this book is a navy officer, architect, and civil engineer who has made a career for himself in the United States. An ardent Fascist, he believes, in Mazzini's words, that "ideas rule the world and its events. A revolution is the passage of an Idea from theory to practice." Fascism, as conceived and practiced in contemporary Italy, is discussed under three aspects: as a way of life, as a political and economic organization, and as an historical process.

The kernel of the entire philosophy is expressed in the words of the Preface by Dr. Guido Corni, Honorary Governor of Somaliland: "The Nation-State, which is above everything and everybody." War, in Mr. Palmieri's mind, is a primary condition of progress; and perpetual peace is "death instead of life." The Italian race has a "mystic intuition that belief in God, in the Soul, the Fatherland and the power of Ideals is the greatest moulding force of human life." "A church, however, like any other organization of material or spiritual interests, can find its primary reason for existence only in the acquiescence of the State." So, he concludes, the State cannot "abdicate its right to supervision of such a large part of the life of its subjects as their religious life."

Despite its talk of the Spirit and of the Man-God-Universe, it is difficult to find in Mr. Palmieri's exposition anything but a sugar-coated paganism. But his work has distinct practical value as recording official utterances on the aims and ambitions of Fascism.

ON BORROWED TIME. By Lawrence Edward Watkin. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. \$2.50

LAWRENCE E. WATKIN writes a fantastic, mythical story of an old man who succeeded in forcing Death, in the strange person of Mr. Brink, to take an unwilling holiday, and remain literally up a tree for a number of years. As a sermon on death it is not so impressive or realistic as it is in its study and portrayal of life in a small American town.

In his first novel Mr. Watkin has shown more than ordinary talent and literary power, especially in the delineation of characters, and in the natural, easy swing of his dialogue. A more tangible theme may in the future find the author producing a novel of universal interest.

NAHUM AND HABAKKUK. WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By the late Dom Hugh Bévénat, O.S.B., B.A. Longmans, Green and Co. \$1

SLOWLY, as scholarship requires, but surely too, the Westminster Version progresses, bringing to the sacred text the vividness of a modern English appeal. Dom Hugh did not live to complete his work but the missing parts were supplied by Father Lattey who has tried to follow out the author's views with which he was well acquainted. The result is a small volume compact with erudition and sane Biblical exegesis. Nahum and Habakkuk deserve more attention from Catholics and the present translation makes them easy reading. No lyric in the Bible surpasses the last chapter of Habakkuk and this English rendition has quite measured up to the Hebrew. As one reads these pulsing lines, one is reminded forcibly of Thompson's *Hound of Heaven* and "those strong Feet that followed, followed after." This volume and all its forerunners in the Westminster Version deserve the support of all Catholic scholars and libraries and should be on the bookshelf of every priest.

THEATRE

THE STAR-WAGON. Those of us who have experienced an occasional wish to have time turn backward and give us an opportunity to live our lives over, can discover the unwisdom of this aspiration by following Maxwell Anderson's new play, *The Star-Wagon*, at the Empire Theatre. Incidentally we can have a gorgeous evening there, and see some of the best acting and direction shown on the American stage in this decade. We can also set our brains and imaginations to work, if they are capable of such effort, and learn whether we are too literal-minded to appreciate a superb dramatic flight of fancy, or whether we are like the dazed youth in the next seat, who is audibly wondering what the play is about. Best of all, perhaps, we can find comfort in the soothing philosophy underlying Mr. Anderson's latest dramatic excursion. This appears to be that if we were given our lives, or any part of them, to live over, as the characters in *The Star-Wagon* are, we would probably make a worse failure of the second effort than of the first, just as they did. The playwright's conclusion, as I read it, is that we will do better to leave well enough alone.

From all of which it will be seen that the theme of *The Star-Wagon* is not new. Countless playwrights have turned back the wheels of time for their characters. Usually, these backward flights are merely jogs to memory, though Barrie, in his *Dear Brutus*, showed us delightfully the reverse of Mr. Anderson's medal. He let his characters see, in their enchanted woods, the things that might have happened. He gave his hero, for example, some golden days with the glamorous young daughter he had never had—and incidentally he gave Helen Hayes, in the role of that daughter, her chance to win fame almost over night.

Mr. Anderson goes further. He gives his characters the chance to change their lives and to avoid their early mistakes. But in *The Star-Wagon* the characters really make their mistakes in their second trial. Thus the inventor, Burgess Meredith, who has married the girl he loved (Lillian Gish), and who has passed his first half century of life enriching others by his inventions and getting merely a pittance for her and for himself, marries a rich girl in his second experiment. His punishment is inevitable, if rather artless. He degenerates mentally and spiritually under the burden of wealth and success, and he is utterly wretched. Fortunately, he can whirl himself back to the present with the machine he has invented, and he and his wife (she has taken the backward flight with him) go on contentedly together.

The play is a fine piece of work, written this time in prose. But its magic lies in the opportunity it gives Lillian Gish and Burgess Meredith to do the best acting of their careers. Not even the great love scene in *High Tor* was more perfectly done than the love scene in *The Star-Wagon*; and there are half a dozen other episodes in the new drama that send down the spines of spectators the thrill caused by perfect art.

Second only to the acting of Mr. Meredith and Miss Gish is that of Russell Collins, who lives in our memories as *Johnny Johnson*. In *The Star-Wagon* he is Hanus Wicks, the one character who made a mistake in his first trial at living and who corrected it in his second. His mistake had been to marry. He emerges triumphantly from his second test, a care-free bachelor.

The work of Guthrie McClintic, producer and director, gives a new standard to the theatre. Mildred Natwick puts the fire of life into the somewhat exaggerated character of Mrs. Rutledge. But the memory most of the spectators at the Empire Theatre these nights will carry away with them is of the lights and shadows on Burgess Meredith's face during the love scenes—lights and shadows never arranged by any director or stage technician.

ELIZABETH JORDAN

FILMS

MADAME X. When the stage exhumes its franker melodramas, it usually does so in a superior, tongue-in-cheek spirit; but the movie producers, being less self-conscious in the matter of tear-shedding, deck their faded favorites in high seriousness and start the old cycle all over again. Close on the high heels of "Stella Dallas" comes Jacqueline Fleuriot and she concedes nothing, either in sin or suffering, to her unfortunate sister. The old story of the errant wife, spurned by her flinty husband, who sinks to the depths is retold with determined pathos. When the derelict becomes the pawn of a blackmailer, she kills him and stands trial, defended by a son who is kept ignorant of her identity. Death anticipates the verdict of the jury. The tale which was once rather sordid is now wholly artificial; all the wiles of director Sam Wood cannot completely dispel the notion that here is a melodrama which would deserve four stars in a wax-work museum. Gladys George, in the title role, lends much effectiveness by her excellent characterization and she is as restrained as the part will allow. John Beal is briefly and genuinely moving as the young lawyer, while Reginald Owen, Warren William and Henry Daniell supply all shades of character from white to deep purple. The film is in the tradition of waxed moustaches and the periodical unearthing of baby shoes, in spite of surface modernizations, but it is smooth enough to strike the usual amount of sentimental adults as first-rate entertainment. (MGM)

LIFE BEGINS AT COLLEGE. Football and the lunatic Ritz Brothers combine to make this offering timely and wildly amusing. There is little in the film except the capers of the featured trio, so that, if your taste in comedy is excessively refined, you will notice the slightness of the story and the ordinary sound of the music. But for the devotees, it will enliven the Autumn scene considerably. The old coach at Lombardy College, founded to educate the Indians, is in danger of losing his professional scalp to disgruntled alumni. But a genuine Indian finally enrolls in the school and solves all the football problems. The Ritz family scrambles through the action, missing no opportunity to complicate the game and the campus romance. Fred Stone, Gloria Stuart, Nat Pendleton and Tony Martin are included in a uniformly good cast. The football scenes help to add to the family appeal of this picture. (Twentieth Century-Fox)

THE GAME THAT KILLS. An alert little drama of commercialized sport, this film delves into the machinations of gamblers who make ice hockey more of a peril to life and limb than it is naturally. The plot is unfolded in the manner of serial pictures, but the action is brisk and exciting enough to hold average attention. A Canadian hockey player, with the help of a girl reporter who is kidnapped and heroically rescued in due course, cleans up the gambling racket which throttles the sport in New York and which was responsible for his brother's death. Charles Quigley, Rita Hayworth and J. Farrell MacDonald are adequate in a film evidently aimed at young audiences. (Columbia)

CARNIVAL QUEEN. This is a dull and inept picture which adds the tactical error of approximating too closely the vulgar atmosphere of a traveling carnival. A witless heroine invests in a tent show and almost loses the family fortune. The sinister figures of hot dog concessionaires lurk in the background as a faithful employee saves all. Robert Wilcox, Dorothea Kent and Hobart Cavanagh help matters little. It is adult fare of a poor and wearisome quality. (Universal)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

IN last week's press appeared an Open Letter signed by 150 Protestant ministers, educators, editors attacking the Catholic Church in Spain by misrepresenting the recent joint letter of the Spanish hierarchy. The *Open Letter* was one long succession of blows below the belt. A sports writer would have described the assault thus: "The signatories evidently felt their only hope lay in foul punches." . . . The performance was something like that of the ventriloquist, Eddie Bergen and his dummy, Charlie McCarthy, except that Eddie never makes Charlie mouth Ku Klux Klan diatribes. The signatories dressed up a dummy, called it the Spanish pastoral, made it say things the pastoral never said. Americans thought the dummy was really the joint letter of the Spanish Bishops, and were naturally horrified when they heard it bleating against democratic government and other things Americans cherish. . . . The "open letter" had a very bad breath. One sniffed the unpleasant odor immediately. It was the breath of bigots. . . . The letter defends the Red regime in Spain, the regime which has butchered thousands of priests and nuns, burned countless churches, and which is at this very moment attempting to set up an atheistic, anti-Christ government. . . . The letter literally bristles with distortions of fact. Among the signers are Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the New York church built by Standard Oil millions, Walter Dill Scott, president of Northwestern University, Dr. Harry F. Ward, Union Theological Seminary, seven Columbia University professors, an apostate Spanish priest, many Protestant ministers. . . .

The Spanish situation is this: Between February and July, 1936, 411 churches were destroyed and profaned. The Madrid Government did nothing to prevent the constantly increasing mob violence against religion. Catholics had no defense whatever. Their rights, their lives were threatened. An atheistic dictatorship was just ready to be set up when Franco beat the Leftists to the draw. . . . If all this had happened in the United States instead of in Spain, would the signatories have defended the atheistic forces as they did in their "open letter"? If so, we would probably have seen news dispatches like these:

News Flash. Anti-religious mobs gain upper hand in Washington. Burn down Catholic University. Number of priests murdered unknown. Government refuses to interfere. Dr. Harry F. Ward denies Government failed to protect university, sees anti-democratic trend in protest by Catholic Bishops.

News Flash. A huge throng of anarchists and Communists scuttled St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York yesterday. Statues and vestments were piled up on Fifth Ave. Traffic was impeded for hours. Only four priests were murdered. Cardinal Hayes protested to the Government, sought protection which was refused. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of Riverside church issued a statement. "It is to be regretted that Cardinal Hayes, by his protest, has injected the religious issue into this clash between the forces of democracy and reaction. Does he not believe in the separation of Church and State?"

News Flash. Notre Dame University was invaded by an atheistic mob last evening and razed to the ground. Survivors among the Notre Dame faculty protested to the Government, pleaded for protection. Dr. Walter Dill Scott, president of Northwestern University declared: "The action of the survivors among the Notre Dame faculty makes one wonder if they favor the American form of government. Does the Vatican associate itself with the Notre Dame protest? One-hundred per cent, red-blooded Americans would like to know." THE PARADER